



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## The Divine Name in Exodus iii. 14

WILLIAM R. ARNOLD

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE section of the Book of Exodus in which this verse occurs is a familiar one. It describes Jahweh's initial appearance to Moses and the latter's commission to deliver the Children of Israel from the Egyptian bondage. The Jahwistic and Elohist sources have been so closely interwoven at this point that the greatest difference of opinion exists among critics as to the attribution of the material. There are hardly two writers who do not disagree at some point or other in the course of the third chapter, while some make no attempt at a complete analysis. There is, however, universal agreement regarding the fact that the passage which has to do with Moses' inquiry after the proper name of the god of Israel's fathers and the ensuing reply, is to be assigned to the E source. Not merely has it the earmark of the appellative אֱלֹהִים, but the J source has no room or occasion for such an episode, whereas the E document almost requires it. Dillmann, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Jülicher, Kittel, Driver, Cornill, Bacon, Baentsch, Holzinger, Moore, Carpenter and Harford — all are agreed that vss. <sup>10-15</sup> contain no J material, though a number of them maintain that redactional elements are not lacking. That is the position assumed in this paper.

Nor, for the purposes of our discussion, does it make any difference whether or not we hold with Steuernagel that all the subsequent passages in the E document in which the name יְהוָה occurs, together with vss. <sup>13-15</sup> of this chapter, in which the name is formally introduced, are additions from the hand of E<sup>2</sup>, the original E source knowing nothing of

this disclosure of the name and continuing after as before to employ **אלהים**.<sup>1</sup> Nothing that we have to say is in any way affected by shifting the entire series of **יהוה** passages from the middle of the eighth to the middle of the seventh century B.C. We may consider the whole of E a document of the middle of the seventh century, disregarding the fact that the greater part of it was taken from an earlier written source. That document introduced the name **יהוה** for the first time in the call of Moses, and employed the name from time to time thereafter.

In any case, this passage gives us much more than we require. It is not content with introducing the name **יהוה** at the appropriate point in the Elohist narrative; it goes on to obtrude—or rather, it begins by obtruding, two occult expressions, which have some shadowy connection with the name to be communicated. Instead of the expected **יהוה**, God answers Moses' inquiry, "When the children of Israel ask me thy name, what shall I say unto them?" with the enigmatic **אשר אדירה**, and continues, "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, **אדירה** hath sent me unto you."

In spite of the fact that what we want, and what Moses is represented as wanting, is a name, and not a definition of the name, or a characterization of the person bearing it, it is assumed (so far as I know, by all scholars) that the writer of vs.<sup>14</sup> here puts into the mouth of Jahweh at once a definition of his name and a characterization of his person. That the definition is more or less opaque, and the characterization more or less unintelligible, are not held to be very serious defects. However much they may have discommoded Moses, they furnish rare opportunities for the gyrations of the "religionsgeschichtlicher Luftballon." Ordinarily, this definition and characterization is not, among modern scholars, taken to represent anything but the mind of the indi-

<sup>1</sup> *Studien und Kritiken*, 1899, pp. 339 ff.; anticipated by Bacon, *Triple Tradition of the Exodus*, pp. lii and 23, and in part by Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*<sup>2</sup>, p. 72. The more defensible position is to abide by Wellhausen's suggestion, assigning Exodus 3<sup>13-15</sup> to the original source, while attributing the subsequent **יהוה** sections to a later hand.

vidual Elohist writer, who labored unsuccessfully to bring to expression the product of his own theological speculations. Kautzsch, however, asserts that "the rejection of the interpretation [of the name Jahweh] offered in Exodus 3<sup>15</sup> [slip for <sup>14</sup>] involves the conclusion that even the early sources of the Pentateuch were in error as to the true meaning of the most important and most sacred Divine name in Israel," and asks, "Can it be supposed that at the time of E (c. 750 B.C.) the living apprehension of the genius of the Hebrew language was no longer adequate to interpret correctly a name like Jahweh? We cannot help thinking that this question has been answered in the affirmative far too hastily by those who follow the prevailing current of opinion on this subject. And we are only strengthened in our conviction when we note the extremely varied interpretations which have been proposed as substitutes for that adopted in Exodus 3<sup>15</sup> [<sup>14</sup>]." <sup>2</sup>

I think it can be shown (against Kautzsch) that Exodus 3<sup>14</sup> affords no data for the scientific determination of the origin and meaning of the name Jahweh; and (against the current view) that this verse is in no way concerned with the subject of the origin and meaning of the name, and accordingly does not even give us the writer's views upon that subject; and finally that the phrase *אֲדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָי* in vs. <sup>14a</sup> and the word *אֲדֹנָי* in <sup>14b</sup>, upon which all this theorizing has been based, were not to be found in the E document, but came into the text of the completed Pentateuch several hundred years after the middle of the seventh century, certainly not long before 300 B.C.

One cannot operate with uncertain quantities. Our first task must be to remove all doubt as to the priority of the Masoretic text, and our second task will be to determine the meaning of its language. Only then shall we be in a position to deal with the literary and historical questions involved.

<sup>2</sup> Article *Religion of Israel* in the Extra Volume of Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, pp. 625 f.; cf. the same author's article on *Divine Names*, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 3323.

The question as to the text may be finally disposed of. Nowhere is there any trace of an original Hebrew other than that of our current editions, viz.: **וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל מֹשֶׁה** <sup>14</sup> **אֱהִיה אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיה וַיֹּאמֶר כֹּה תֹאמַר לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֱהִיה שְׁלַחְנִי אֵלֵיכֶם**; <sup>15</sup> **וַיֹּאמֶר עוֹד אֱלֹהִים אֶל מֹשֶׁה כֹּה תֹאמַר אֶל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוֹה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וְאֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב שְׁלַחְנִי אֵלֵיכֶם זֶה שְׁמִי לְעֹלָם וְזֶה זְכוּרִי לְדֹר דֹּר**:

The variants of Hebrew manuscripts recorded by Kennicott and De Rossi are as follows: In vs.<sup>14</sup>, one manuscript omits the initial **וַיֹּאמֶר**; one manuscript omits **אֲשֶׁר**; one manuscript repeats **אֲשֶׁר**; one manuscript omits **וַיֹּאמֶר כֹּה תֹאמַר לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֱהִיה**; <sup>3</sup> all these indubitably represent careless departure from the current text. For **לְבְנֵי** of vs.<sup>14b</sup>, thirteen Hebrew manuscripts of Kennicott and twelve more of De Rossi have, with the Soncino edition (1488) and apparently all Samaritan manuscripts, **אֶל בְּנֵי**, as in vs.<sup>15</sup>; four more of Kennicott and ten of De Rossi were corrected to **לְבְנֵי** from first hand **אֶל בְּנֵי**; one of De Rossi began to write **אֶל בְּנֵי** but changed to **לְבְנֵי**, while another of De Rossi actually had **לְבְנֵי** corrected to **אֶל בְּנֵי**; the difference is quite immaterial, though, to judge from vs.<sup>13</sup>, the writer's style was not so uniform, rather varying for the sake of euphony, so that **לְבְנֵי** of our text would seem to be the original. For the final **אֵלֵיכֶם** four manuscripts spell **אֲלֵכֶם**. In vs.<sup>15a</sup>, two manuscripts have **עוֹד אֱלֹהִים** in place of **עוֹד אֱלֹהִים**; one manuscript inserts **אֱהִיה** between **מֹשֶׁה** and **כֹּה**; three manuscripts have **לְבְנֵי**, as in vs.<sup>14</sup>, in place of **אֶל בְּנֵי**; one manuscript has **יִשֵּׁר** for **יִשְׂרָאֵל**; one manuscript has **אֵלֵיכֶם שְׁלַחְנִי אֱהִיה** before **יְהוֹה**; one manuscript has **אַבְרָהָם** instead of **אַבְתִּיכֶם**, repeating **אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם**; five manuscripts omit **אַבְתִּיכֶם**; two Samaritan manuscripts spell **אַבְתִּיכֶם**; four Masoretic manuscripts have, with the Samaritans, **ו** before **יִצְחָק אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק**; one manuscript has **שְׁלַח** for **שְׁלַחְנִי**; four manuscripts (two of them the same as in the case of vs.<sup>14</sup>) have **אֲלֵכֶם** for **אֵלֵיכֶם**. In vs.<sup>15b</sup>, six Masoretic manuscripts have, with the Samaritans and the Soncino edition, **לְעוֹלָם** for **לְעֹלָם**, and five more have

<sup>3</sup> This is the only possible interpretation of Kennicott's "2° אֱהִיה... וַיֹּאמֶר 75."

been corrected to ללעלם.<sup>4</sup> Finally, five Masoretic manuscripts read לדור דור, and two more did so originally; one manuscript inserts the conjunction, while retaining the defective spelling, לדר דר, and three have the conjunction with plene spelling, לדור דור. The Samaritans spell variously, לדר דר, לדור דר, and לדור דור, but all, apparently, have the conjunction. Of these variants, all that do not consist in mere difference of spelling are unmistakable corruptions of our received text. דר דר, with the conjunction, occurs much oftener, especially in the later literature, but דר דר, though it occurs only twice elsewhere in the Old Testament, is unquestionably the more idiomatic Hebrew.

Coming to the Alexandrian Greek version, Codex Alexandrinus (A) and Codex Vaticanus (B) agree to the letter as regards all but the two words bracketed below, which are omitted by A. I have derived the readings of A and B directly from the photographic reproductions of the manuscripts: <sup>14</sup> Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Μωϋσῆν [λέγων], ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν· καὶ εἶπεν, οὕτως ἐρεῖς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, ὁ ὢν ἀπέσταλκέν με πρὸς ὑμᾶς. <sup>15</sup> καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πάλιν πρὸς Μωϋσῆν, οὕτως ἐρεῖς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν, θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ, ἀπέσταλκέν με πρὸς ὑμᾶς· τοῦτό μού ἐστιν ὄνομα αἰῶνιον καὶ μνημόσυνον [γενεῶν] γενεαῖς.

In the omission of λέγων A is supported by Codex Ambrosianus (Lagarde F)<sup>5</sup>—which with Alexandrinus is left unnoticed by Holmes in this connection—and, according to Holmes, by Codex Coislinianus (Lagarde M), the only remaining uncial that contains the passage, besides the cursives, Holmes 14, 15, 18, 25, 30, 32, 52, 55, 56, 57, 59, 64, 71, 74, 75, 76, 83, 84, 106, 107, 108, 131, 134, 135, the Complutensian, Aldine, and Grabian editions, the text of Nicephorus, and several daughter versions. The weight of evidence, with-

<sup>4</sup> Fanciful Rabbinical speculations bear express witness to the universal defective spelling of the word in this passage in earlier times; see *b. Pesahim* 50a, *Qiddushin* 71a, *j. Yoma* 40d, and *Shemoth Rabba*, *ad loc.*

<sup>5</sup> See Ceriani's edition of the manuscript, *Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. iii. pp. 25 f.

out any regard to the Hebrew, obliges us to exclude λέγων from the Greek text. That done, the text of A and B is entirely in accord with the Masoretic Hebrew. The conjunction before θεός Ἰσαάκ and the uniform rendering of לבני and אל בני could hardly be avoided in the Greek; while the dependence of μνημόσυνον on τοῦτό μου ἔστιν was too obvious to tolerate the repetition of that phrase. Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν is of course not the proper equivalent of אהיה אשר אהיה, but it is not a proper equivalent of any imaginable Hebrew, and is more likely to be based upon this somewhat cryptical, than upon a more transparent Hebrew; the original yielded the Greek translator no thought, only a verb, and he supplied the thought. As regards γενεῶν γενεαῖς of B and γενεαῖς of A, it would be sufficient for our purposes to point out that whether the Greek translator rendered γενεῶν γενεαῖς or merely γενεαῖς, לדר לדר must be assumed for the Hebrew that lay before him. In my judgment, however, A will represent the original Greek, though it is apparently alone in the reading γενεαῖς; for the order γενεῶν γενεαῖς, which is opposed with γενεαῖς γενεῶν by five cursives only (H. 19, 108, 118, 53, 72, of which the first three are "Lucianic" and the last "Hexaplaric"), is not a natural one, and the single Greek plural word occurs elsewhere for the iterated Hebrew singular: εἰς γενεάς is the rendering of מדר לדר in Isaiah 34<sup>10</sup> and of דור ודור in Isaiah 61<sup>4</sup>.

Among the numerous recorded variants from the above Greek text, there are, in the first place, certain manifest errors of omission due to homœoteleuton: one manuscript (H. 53) skips from πρὸς Μωσῆν in vs.<sup>14</sup> to the words following the same phrase in vs.<sup>15</sup>; the same manuscript passes from θεός preceding τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν to the word Ἀβραάμ; two manuscripts (H. 72, 74) pass from τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ of vs.<sup>14</sup> to what follows these words in vs.<sup>15</sup>; and one manuscript (H. 54) passes from τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν of vs.<sup>15</sup> to the words following the same expression in vs.<sup>16</sup>.

In the next place, there are a number of variants which, however relevant they may be to the reconstruction of the original form of the Alexandrian version, have no bearing

on the question of the underlying Hebrew. Such are the readings *εἶπε δέ* or *εἶπεν δέ* of a few cursives (among them the "Lucianic" H. 19, 108, 118) for *καὶ εἶπεν* in <sup>14a</sup> or <sup>15</sup>; the form *ἀπέσταλκε*, without final *ν*; the insertion in a large number of cursives and three early editions of the article *ὁ* before *θεὸς Ἀβραάμ*, *θεὸς Ἰσαάκ*, and *θεὸς Ἰακώβ*; the reading *ἀπέστειλε* of the "Lucianic" manuscripts H. 108 and 118 for *ἀπέσταλκε* in vs.<sup>15</sup>; the reading *μοί* for *μοῦ* in a few cursives; the insertion of *τό* before *ὄνομα* in the Complutensian Polyglott. In the same category belong the omission of the initial *καί* by five cursives in vs.<sup>14</sup> and by two cursives in vs.<sup>15</sup>, and of course the erroneous *γενεάς* for *γενεαῖς* of H. 75, as well as the reading *γενεαῖς γενεῶν* referred to above.

Lastly, there are the variants which might bear on the original Hebrew if they represent the earliest form of the Greek version. Ten cursive manuscripts (H. 14, 16, 25, 32, 52, 54, 57, 77, 78, 130) have for *θεός* of vs.<sup>14</sup> *Κύριος ὁ θεός*; the reading, even if it were more strongly sustained than it is, would have to be rejected on the merits of the question: *יהוה אלהים* is utterly impossible in this connection. The same is true of the Complutensian's simple *Κύριος* for *θεός*. Six cursives (H. 16, 25, 52, 54, 78, 131) and the text of Nicephorus omit the troublesome *καὶ εἶπεν* at the beginning of vs.<sup>14b</sup>; the omission of the phrase is easily accounted for, but its introduction, on the other hand, would be quite unaccountable. An isolated manuscript (H. 83) goes one step farther and omits with *καὶ εἶπεν* the preceding *ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ὢν*, being doubtless influenced by the *πρὸς Μωυσῆν οὕτως ἐρεῖς κ. τ. λ.* of vs.<sup>15</sup>. Lagarde's uncial M and one cursive (H. 18) omit *μέ* in vs.<sup>14</sup>; one cursive (H. 106) omits *ὁ θεὸς πάλιν πρὸς Μωυσῆν* in vs.<sup>15</sup>, imitating the *καὶ εἶπεν οὕτως ἐρεῖς* of <sup>14b</sup>; another cursive (H. 75) omits *πάλιν*, imitating vs.<sup>14a</sup>; and another (H. 72) omits *πρὸς Μωυσῆν* of vs.<sup>15</sup>. All these almost certainly involve only oversight on the part of the copyists of the individual manuscripts concerned. The fifth century Codex Ambrosianus (Lagarde F) and the seventh century M besides ten cursives (H. 18, 55, 58, 59, 64, 72, 84, 85, 107, 134) have *πάλιν ὁ θεός* in place of *ὁ θεὸς πάλιν*, while ten



more cursives (H. 14, 16, 25, 32, 52, 54, 57, 73, 78, 131 — in the main the same that insert *Kýrios* in vs.<sup>14</sup>), and the text of Nicephorus have *πάλιν Κύριος ὁ θεός*. Disregarding the element *Kýrios* on the grounds alleged above, one might be inclined to accept this as the original order of the Greek version, since it more closely conforms to the Hebrew עוֹד אֱלֹהִים; but the reading of A and B and congeners is not so easily disposed of, nor does that reading necessarily bespeak a Hebrew עוֹד אֱלֹהִים. It is most reasonable to suppose that the reading *πάλιν ὁ θεός* goes back to an early correction aiming at more rigid conformity to the Hebrew order. The variant *πάλιν ὁ θεός*, then, will confirm the Hebrew text, while not invalidating the reading *ὁ θεός πάλιν* as the original form of the Greek version. Of the remaining variants none need detain us. H. 106 alone has *πρὸς αὐτοὺς* for *τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ* of vs.<sup>15</sup>; the Sixtine edition, supported presumably by a number of Holmes's cursives, prints *ἡμῶν* for *υἱῶν*; and H. 55 adds *ὥπταί μοι* after *υἱῶν*, in imitation of vs.<sup>16</sup>.

We must hold that the Hebrew which lay before the translator of this passage in the Alexandrian Greek version was the same as that of our Masoretic text.

That being the case, we can hardly expect to encounter any adverse testimony in the later versions.

Of the other Greek versions we know no more than was recorded already by Montfaucon.<sup>6</sup> According to the manuscript H. 64 (Montfaucon's Reg. 1871), Aquila and Theodotion had in vs.<sup>14</sup> *ἔσομαι ἔσομαι* (for *אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה*), and Symmachus had in vs.<sup>15</sup> *ἀνάμνησίς μου* (for *זִכְרִי*). Of the former, Montfaucon remarks, "Videtur excidisse *ὅς* ac legendum *ἔσομαι ὅς ἔσομαι*, *ero qui ero*, ut consonent cum Hebraico *אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה*." So also both Bahr<sup>7</sup> "Videtur *ὅς* excidisse," and Field, "ubi pronomen excidisse videtur." Field cites the rendering of Græcus Venetus, *ἔσομαι ὅς ἔσομαι*; but the Jewish author of the Venetus had no need of Aquila and Theodotion to guide him to that rendering; — the Complutensian Polyglott, not many decades after, translated the

<sup>6</sup> *Hexaplorum Origenis quæ supersunt*, Paris, 1713, vol. i. pp. 60 f.

<sup>7</sup> *Hexaplorum Origenis quæ supersunt*, Leipzig, 1769, Part i. p. 268.

אֱהִי אֲשֶׁר אֱהִי of the Targum text with *ero qui ero*. That a relative pronoun has been carelessly omitted in the transmission of the rendering of those ancient versions is, however, probable enough.

The Targum of Onqelos, the Samaritan Targum, and the Peshîṭa for Exodus 31<sup>4f.</sup> are practically literal renderings of our Masoretic text. In all three versions the Hebrew אֱהִי אֲשֶׁר אֱהִי of 14<sup>a</sup> and אֱהִי of 14<sup>b</sup> are carried over with no attempt at interpretation.

The consonantal text of Onqelos in the Complutensian Polyglott is as follows: וַאֲמַר יְיָ לְמֹשֶׁה אֱהִי אֲשֶׁר אֱהִי<sup>14</sup> וַאֲמַר כְּדֵן תִּימַר לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֱהִי שְׁלַחְנִי לִוְתֹּכֶן<sup>15</sup> וַאֲמַר עוֹד יְיָ לְמֹשֶׁה כְּדֵן תִּימַר לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יְיָ אֱלֹהֵא דַאֲבַהַתְכֹן אֱלֹהֵי דַאֲבַרְהֶם אֱלֹהֵי דִיעַחַק וְאֱלֹהֵי דִיעַקֵב שְׁלַחְנִי לִוְתֹּכֶן דֵּן שְׁמִי לְעֹלָם וְדֵן דִּוְכַרְנִי לְכָל דֵּר וְדֵר. That of the London Polyglott is identical with this, save that it prints יי for יי. Berliner's reprint (1884) of the Sabbioneta edition of 1557, besides employing יי, differs only in the reading אֱלֹהֵי instead of אֱלֹהֵי before דִיעַחַק and דִיעַקֵב. The isolated variant for vs.<sup>14</sup> referred to by Berliner (Part ii. p. 183), I have not been able to ascertain. The Targum's habitual substitution of יי for אֱלֹהִים of the Hebrew is of course of no textual significance.

For the Samaritan Targum I transliterate from Petermann's edition (Berlin, 1882): וַאֲמַר אֱלֹהֵי אֵל מֹשֶׁה אֱהִי<sup>14</sup> אֲשֶׁר אֱהִי וַאֲמַר אֱבַהֵן תִּימַר לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֱהִי שְׁלַחְנִי לִוְדֹכֹן<sup>15</sup> וַאֲמַר עוֹד אֱלֹהֵי לְמֹשֶׁה אֱבַהֵן תִּימַר לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוֹה אֱלֹהֵי אֱבַהַתְכֹן אֱלֹהֵי אֲבַרְהָם וְאֱלֹהֵי יַחַק וְאֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב שְׁלַחְנִי לִוְדֹכֹן דֵּן שְׁמִי לְעוֹלָם וְדֵן דְּכַרִּי לְדֵר וְדֵר. The variants resulting from Petermann's collations are: in vs.<sup>14</sup>, אֱלֹהִים for אֱלֹהֵי; אֵל מֹשֶׁה for לְמֹשֶׁה; אֱבַהֵן for אֱבַהֵן; לְבְנֵי for לְבְנֵי; שְׁדַרְנִי and שְׁלַחְנִי for שְׁלַחְנִי; in vs.<sup>15</sup>, אֲמַר for אֲמַר; אֱלֹהִים for אֱלֹהֵי; אֵלֵה for אֵלֵה; אֱבַהֵן for אֱבַהֵן; תִּימַר omitted; לְבְנֵי for לְבְנֵי; אֱלֹהֵי for אֱלֹהֵי, and similarly in the two parallel phrases following; for שְׁלַחְנִי as in vs.<sup>14</sup>; לְעוֹלָם and לְעוֹלָם for לְעוֹלָם; דְּכַרִּי for דְּכַרִּי; and לְדֹר for לְדֹר. The variants, when not scribal errors, are but different renderings of our Hebrew text.



*Moyſen: EGO SUM QUI SUM. Ait: Sic dices filiſ Israel: QUI EST, miſit me ad voſ. Dixitq. iterum Deus ad Moyſen: Hæc dices filiſ Israel: Dominuſ Deus patrum veſtrorum, Deus Abraham, Deus Isaac, & Deus Iacob miſit me ad voſ: hoc nomen mihi eſt in æternuſ, & hoc memoriale meum in generationem & generationem.* The Antwerp Polyglott, except in ſpelling *hæc* and *æternuſ*, conforms to the Complutenuſian. The Pariſ Polyglott follows the Antwerp in all but the laſt claule, where for *in generatione et generationem* it haſ only *in generationem*. Walton's Polyglott agreeſ entirely with the Clementine edition. The additional variantſ exhibited by manuſcriptſ and editionſ of the Vulgate recorded by Vercellone<sup>9</sup> are: in vs.<sup>14a</sup>, *Dixitque* for *Dixit*; *Dominuſ* for *Deuſ*; in <sup>14b</sup>, *ait* omitted; in <sup>15</sup>, *iterum Dominuſ* for *iterum Deuſ*. Of theſe only the ſecond variant iſ exhibited by more than one or two unimportant manuſcriptſ. Codex Amiatinuſ haſ *veſtrum* for *veſtrorum*. Almoſt all manuſcriptſ and printed editionſ, according to Vercellone, ſupport the Complutenuſian againſt the Clementine in the reading *et Deuſ Isaac*, while a few manuſcriptſ omit the conjunction before both *Deuſ Isaac* and *Deuſ Iacob*. Vercellone's teſtimony regarding the variant *in generationem* — *in generatione* iſ ſomewhat vague, but the Complutenuſian reading *in generatione et generationem* would ſeem to be the beſt ſupported. It iſ not poſſible, from the unſystematic ſumming up of Vercellone's collationſ, to determine exactly the readingſ of certain manuſcriptſ throughout the two verſeſ. But there can be little doubt that the text of the Complutenuſian for Exodus 3<sup>14f</sup>. iſ in all reſpectſ the beſt ſupported tradition of the Latin of Jerome.

Before conſidering the relation of Jerome's verſion to the Hebrew expreſſionſ *אֲדִיָה אֲשֶׁר אֲדִיָה* and *אֲדִיָה*, we ſhould notice the freedom with which, here aſ elſewhere, while tolerably true to hiſ original, he varieſ the Latin for ſtyliſtic reaſonſ in caſeſ where he muſt of neceſſity haſ had the ſame Hebrew. *וַיֹּאמֶר* iſ rendered *dixit* in vs.<sup>14a</sup>, *ait* in <sup>14b</sup>, and *dixitque* in <sup>15</sup>; *כֹּה הָאֵמַר* iſ rendered *sic dices* in <sup>14</sup>, and

<sup>9</sup> *Variae lectiones vulgatae Latinae Bibliorum editionis*, Rome, 1860-1864.

*haec dices* in <sup>15</sup>; *וה שמי* is *hoc nomen mihi est*, but *וה זכרי* is *hoc memoriale meum*. Under the circumstances we are not warranted in assuming that he had *יצחק* against the Masoretic *אלהי יצחק*, or *לבני ישראל* in vs.<sup>15</sup> against the Masoretic *אל בני ישראל*. And whatever be the authentic Hieronymic text of the last clause of vs.<sup>15</sup>, we need not look beyond the *לדר דר* of our Masoretic text for the underlying Hebrew. I suspect, however, that the best Vulgate reading transmitted to us, *in generatione et generationem*, has resulted from original INGENERATIONEMGENERATIONEM = *לדר דר*.

Turning to the renderings *Ego sum qui sum* and *Qui est misit me ad vos*, we must notice, in the first place, that they are not original with Jerome. It is a mere coincidence of grammatical parts of speech that *Ego sum qui sum* appears to be nearer to the Hebrew *איהו אשר איהו* than does the Greek *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν*; as a matter of fact it is farther from the Hebrew. Both of the Vulgate clauses were adopted by Jerome from the Old Latin usage, based, of course, upon the Greek text alone.

The following sources for the reconstruction of the "Old Latin" of Exodus 3<sup>14</sup> were enumerated by Sabatier.<sup>10</sup> I cite the quotations of the Fathers, and for convenience of reference give the volume (Roman numerals) and column (Arabic numerals) of Migne's *Patrologia Latina* where each quotation may be found: *Ego sum qui sum*, Novatian, *De trinitate* (iii. 920); *Ego sum qui sum* and further on *Ego sum qui sum semper*, Phoebadius Aginnensis, *Contra Arianos* (xx. 24); *Ego sum qui sum*. . . . *Haec dices filiis Israel, Misit me ad vos is qui est*, Hilary of Poitiers, *De trinitate* i. 5 (x. 28); *Ego sum qui sum*, id. i. 6 (x. 28); *Ego sum qui sum*. . . . *Sic dices filiis Israel, Misit me ad vos is qui est*, id. iv. 8 (x. 102); *Dixit autem Dominus ad Moysen, Ego sum qui sum. Et dixit, Sic dices filiis Israel, Qui est misit me ad vos*, id. v. 22 (x. 144); *Misit me ad vos is qui est*, id. xii. 24 (x. 447); *Dixit Dominus,*

<sup>10</sup> *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae seu vetus Italica, et caeterae quaecunque in codicibus mss. et antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt*, Paris, 1751.

*Ego sum qui sum.* Dices, *Qui est misit me*, Ambrose, *Epistola viii* (xvi. 953); *Ego sum qui sum*, id. *Enarratio in Psalmum xxxvi* (xiv. 1054); *Ego sum qui sum*. . . . *Misit me qui est*, Augustine, *Tractatus ii in Joannis evangelium* (xxxv. 1389); *Ego sum qui sum.* *Haec dices filiis Israel, Qui est misit me ad vos*, id. *Sermo vi* (xxxviii. 61); *Dices itaque filiis Israel, Qui est misit me ad vos*, id. *Sermo vii* (xxxviii. 63); *Ego sum qui sum.* *Et dices filiis Israel, Qui est misit me ad vos*, Ferrandus, *Epistola ad Reginum* (lxvii. 944). Sabatier mentions further, *Et dixit Dominus ad Moysen, Dic filiis Israel*, Hilary, *In Psalmum cxviii* (ix. 615); and *Vade, dic filiis Israel, Qui est misit me*, Jerome, *Commentarii in Isaiam prophetam*, cap. lii (xxiv. 518); but the former is beside our point, and as regards quotations by Jerome, it would perhaps be chronologically more pertinent to cite *Qui est me misit*, *Epistola xv* (xxii. 35). To the above citations should be added the text of the sixth century Lyons manuscript published by Robert,<sup>11</sup> *Et dixit Deus ad Moysen, Ego sum qui sum.* *Et dixit, Sic dicis[so] filiis Istrahel, Qui est misit me ad vos*; and the passage in the metrical Heptateuch of Cyprianus the Gallic poet, who wrote in the early part of the fifth century and everywhere employs a pre-Hieronymic version,<sup>12</sup>

*Salvator talia iungit :*  
*Ille ego sum qui sum, sic dices, et super astra*  
*Qui viget, estque deus vestrorum a stirpe parentum.*

(Exodus, lines 167 ff.)

It may be questioned whether certain of the Fathers cited were not acquainted with and employing the Vulgate version, and some of the citations may owe their present form to corruption of the patristic text in the direction of the Vulgate. Still, a fair proportion of them will certainly preserve pre-Hieronymic readings. So that we may reasonably assume that the common Old Latin text of our verse

<sup>11</sup> *Version latine du Pentateuque antérieure à Saint Jérôme*, Paris, 1881, pp. 53 f., 168.

<sup>12</sup> See the discussion of Peiper, *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. xxiii. pp. xxv f.

ran as follows: *Dixit* (or *Et dixit*) *deus ad Moysen, Ego sum qui sum. Et dixit, Sic* (or *haec*) *dices filiis Israel, Qui est misit me ad vos.*<sup>13</sup> This Latin is easily derived from the Greek. *Qui est* is ordinary Latin for  $\delta\ \acute{\omega}\nu$ ,<sup>14</sup> and while *Ego sum qui sum* is perhaps more naturally interpreted *It is I that am* than *I am he that is*, the same is true of the Greek, as Greek, with the personal pronoun expressed.<sup>15</sup>

*Ego sum qui sum* and *Qui est misit me ad vos* being derived from the Old Latin and historically based upon the Greek, the question we have to face is not whether they could or could not by any possibility be derived from the Hebrew, but merely whether they could in case of need be reconciled with the Hebrew. For generations these striking texts had been made the basis of theological speculation and demonstration. Had Jerome desired to depart from the common Greek and Latin wording of the passage (which of course was not the case), he lacked the independent Hebrew scholarship which would enable him to do so without a well-defined Jewish tradition to occasion and justify the departure. But Jewish tradition, so far as concerned the

<sup>13</sup> There is no more reason for Sabatier's taking into his reconstructed text of vs.<sup>14a</sup> *Dominus* of Hilary, *De trinitate*, v. 22, than there would be for inserting *Dominus ad Moysen* in vs.<sup>14b</sup>, after that author on Psalm 118.

<sup>14</sup> Compare Tertullian's rendering of Apoc. 1<sup>8</sup>, *Adversus Praxeam*, cap. xvii (Migne, ii. 199).

<sup>15</sup> Of course, *I am he that is* is the unmistakable intent of the Greek in this passage; that is,  $\delta\ \acute{\omega}\nu$  is the logical predicate, not the subject. A less ambiguous reproduction of the sense of the Greek would have been *Ego sum is qui est*. So the Hexaplaric Syriac has ܐܢܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܢ and ܐܝܬܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܢ; see Ceriani, *Pentateuchi Syro-Hexaplaris quae supersunt*, pp. 137 f.; Lagarde-Rahlfs, *Veteris Testamenti Graeci in sermonem Syriacum versi fragmenta*, p. 52; and compare the quotation in the scholion of Jacob of Edessa published by Nestle, *ZDMG*, vol. xxxii. p. 490. Similarly, the Ethiopic: *ānā wē'ētū zāhālō* (*I am he that is*) and *zāhālō fūnāwānī* (*he that is has sent me*); see Dillmann's *Octateuchus Aethiopicus*, p. 100.

A third interpretation of *Ego sum qui sum*, as *I am that I am*, in which *sum* is a copula and nothing more, is quite outside of the intent of the Latin, as it is impossible in the case of the Greek. *Qui est* of <sup>14b</sup> is a sufficient demonstration of the fact. Our familiar English *I am that I am* represents the Latin no more properly than it does the Greek or the Hebrew, and it is high time the expression disappeared from scientific usage.

construction and literal interpretation of the text, and not merely a more or less free speculation as to its basis and import,<sup>16</sup> was able to dodge the issue by rehearsing the expressions as the longer and shorter forms respectively of a divine proper name. And in fact there can be little doubt that had Jerome not found the Greek and Latin before him, he would, in spite of Aquila and Theodotion, have transferred the Hebrew vocables bodily into his own version, as did Targum Onqelos and the Peshîṭa.<sup>17</sup> Jerome

<sup>16</sup> So the Babylonian Gemara, *Berachoth* 9b: "אֲדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָי. — The holy One, blessed be he, said unto Moses, Go and say unto Israel, I have been (הָיִיתִי) with you in this bondage: I will be (אֶהְיֶה) with you in the (future) bondage of the kingdoms (מַלְכוּתִים). And he (Moses) spake before him, Lord of the world, sufficient unto the hour is the evil thereof! The holy One, blessed be he, said unto him, Go and say unto them אֲדֹנָי שְׁלַחְנִי אֵלֵיכֶם." Cf. *Shemoth Rabba*: "וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל מֹשֶׁה. — Rabbi Abba b. Mamal said, The holy One, blessed be he, said unto Moses, Thou seekest to know my name: according to my acts am I designated; sometimes I am called שְׂרֵי, אֵל, at other times צַבְאוֹת אֱלֹהִים, at others יְהוָה. When I judge mankind, my name is אֱלֹהִים; when I make war upon the wicked, my name is צַבְאוֹת; when I bear with the sins of men, my name is שְׂרֵי; and when I shew mercy upon the world, my name is יְהוָה; for יְהוָה is but the symbol of mercy, as it is written יְהוָה יְדוּה אֶל רַחוּם וְחַנּוּן (Exodus 34<sup>6</sup>). So that my name is אֲדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָי because of my acts. Rabbi Yishaq says, The holy One, blessed be he, said unto Moses, Say unto them, What I was in the past, that I am at present and will be in the future (אֲנִי שְׂרֵי וְאֲנִי אֵל וְאֲנִי צַבָּא); therefore אֲדֹנָי occurs three times (in this passage). And further: אֲדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָי. — Rabbi Jacob b. Rabbi Abina, on the authority of Rabbi Hūna of Sepphoris, said, The holy One, blessed be he, said unto Moses, Say unto them, I will be (אֶהְיֶה) with them in this bondage, and in the bondage to which they go (הַבְּדֻלְבָּן) I will be with them. He (Moses) spake before him, And am I to relate this to them? — Sufficient unto the hour is the evil thereof! He said unto him, Nay, thus (only) shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, אֲדֹנָי שְׁלַחְנִי אֵלֵיכֶם; unto thee I make (the future) known, not unto them."

A radically different elaboration is that contained in the Targums Jerushalmi I and II, which connects אֲדֹנָי with the act of bringing into existence, or creation.

<sup>17</sup> Among the ten Hebrew names of the Deity which Jerome enumerates in one of his letters to Marcella (Migne, xxii. 429) is ESER IEIE. The citation is from memory, and knowing his Latin text better than his Hebrew, he obtains the latter by what he assumes to be a re-translation of the former. He proceeds to explain that the name is the *Qui est* of Exodus 31<sup>48</sup>, but evidently forgot that the Hebrew had no אֲשֶׁר at this point. Of course the citation is worthless as a witness to the Hebrew text of his day



is therefore not engaged in a free translation of Hebrew prose at this point, but imagines he is perpetuating the Greek exposition of the (so to speak, etymological) significance of the proper names **אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר אֱלֹהִים** and **אֱלֹהִים**. That the former of these offered no obstacle, *prima facie*, to the perpetuation of the formula *Ego sum qui sum* is self-evident: the Imperfect of a Hebrew verb occurred often enough with present signification. **אֱלֹהִים** would, of course, not be the same person as *Qui est*; but an interpretation, if it is to be one, must make sense, and *Ego sum misit me* is so palpably close to nonsense that the alteration of the Old Latin in that direction, on a mere point of the precise grammatical form of a proper name, was not to be thought of.<sup>18</sup>

Like the Greek, Jewish Aramaic, Samaritan, and Syriac versions made directly from the Hebrew, the Latin Vulgate offers no occasion for questioning that the Masoretic text of

(**ESER IEIE** = **אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה**, 3d person), but it does show clearly that his Jewish teachers, like the translators of the Targum, treated both expressions as names of the Deity.

As a genuine divine name, distinguished from mere circumlocutory epithets, and yet in no way related to the tetragrammaton, **אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר אֱלֹהִים** appears in the Jerusalem Gemara, *Megilla* 71d, and in the Babylonian Gemara, *Shebu'oth* 35a. For its potency as a divine name, the phrase (or some corruption of it) was also employed in incantations, especially in later times, and that even among the Mohammedan Arabs; cf. Goldziher, *ZDMG*, vol. xlviii. pp. 359 f. Already in *b. Baba Bathra* 73a, there is a sailors' yarn about a perilous wave being laid low by means of missiles on which was engraved, **אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱמֵן אֱמֵן סֶלָה**.

<sup>18</sup> *I am hath sent me unto you* is a specialty of our own language, and a favorite one. Watson, in his translation of Hilary's *De trinitate* (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series, vol. ix.), renders the Latin *Misit me ad vos is qui est* of iv. 8 with *I am hath sent me unto you*, after the King James version. Similarly, in Fremantle's edition of Jerome's letters (*ib.* vol. vi.), *Qui est me misit* of Letter xv (Migne, xxii. 35) is rendered *I am hath sent me*. Contrast the Wycliffite versions of Exodus 34.

A proceeding somewhat analogous to Jerome's is that of Parisot, who, in the Latin translation of Aphraates's quotation above-mentioned (*Patrologia Syriaca*, Part i. vol. i. col. 791), makes the author adopt the formula of the Vulgate, *Ego sum qui sum*, whereas Aphraates quotes the Hebrew vocables of the Peshîta version as he would a proper name, with no interpretation whatever.

Exodus 3<sup>14f.</sup> goes back beyond the middle of the third century B.C. (the commonly accepted date of the Alexandrian translation of the Pentateuch into Greek) to some point prior to the final breach (whenever it may have occurred) between the Samaritan and Jerusalem communities.<sup>19</sup>

Our next step is to determine the meaning of the language of the text. This task is not a theological one, nor yet an historical one, but purely linguistic. As Hebrew, the phrase **אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר אֱדָרִי** (and the same is true of the following **אֱדָרִי אֲלֵיכֶם**, in vs.<sup>14b</sup>) can have only one, definite meaning, or one of several just as definite meanings. The context may be needed to determine which particular one of several meanings offered by the language we are to adopt, but the meanings from which the selection is made must be yielded by the language itself. And while a word may be used in pregnant fashion with allusion to a known circle of ideas, such connotation must be substantiated by more than assertion, and cannot in any case be intelligently discussed until the primary denotation has been grasped. Needless to say that the contribution of this or that interpretation to the requirements of a given theory of the development of the religion of Israel, can have no bearing upon the question. Even the renderings of the ancient versions and the exegesis based upon them, are in this case beside the mark: **אֱדָרִי** is a common Hebrew word, and the construction **אֱדָרִי אֲשֶׁר אֱדָרִי** is, as we shall see, a

<sup>19</sup> According to Josephus, about 333 B.C. "Ueber die Entstehung des samaritanischen Schismas giebt es nur einen Bericht, den bei Jos. ant. XI. 72 82<sup>4</sup>, und der ist falsch" (Hölscher, *Palästina in der persischen und hellenistischen Zeit*, p. 37). That it is our only account is quite true. Nehemiah 13<sup>28f.</sup> does not profess to relate to such an episode, and cannot relate to it, if only for the circumstance that the cleavage was not consummated till after the Pentateuch had been both compiled and domesticated. But it does not follow that the statement of Josephus is therefore in its entirety fictitious. How the fact that the schism synchronized with Alexander's conquest could be derived from a "false exegesis" of Nehemiah 13<sup>28f.</sup>, is not apparent. Josephus's statement on that point may or may not rest on good tradition; that it does not, is not demonstrated by his erroneous application of the Nehemiah passage. For the rest, Hölscher's own determination of the date of the schism, by means of the indirect evidence of the combined prophecies of Isaiah 56-66, as soon after the punitive expedition of Artaxerxes Ochus, does not materially conflict with that furnished by Josephus.

not unparalleled Hebrew construction. The versions have rendered us their only possible service: they have borne their testimony to the integrity of the Hebrew text from the third century B.C. to the present time.

The clauses just mentioned, **אֲדֹנָיָה אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָיָה** and **אֲדֹנָיָה שְׁלַחַנִי אֵלֵיכֶם**, are the only parts of the text that present any difficulty and about the interpretation of which there is dispute. The second of these clauses can be dismissed with a few words. Whatever may be the literal meaning of the word **אֲדֹנָיָה**, in this sentence it is in the nominative case, subject of the verb which follows it, and therefore a substantive. Since, moreover, the word is in itself a verb in the first person singular of the Imperfect tense, as a substantive it cannot be an appellative, but must be a proper name. And while a proper name may have a transparent etymology, it is not permissible to drag its etymology into the structure of the sentence in which it occurs. We neither interpret nor render **וַיֵּלֶךְ נָתָן אֶל בֵּיתוֹ** of 1 Samuel 12<sup>15</sup>, *And gave went to his house*. The question as to the origin of the name and the reason for its bestowal may be legitimately raised, but not in the act of rendering a sentence in which it is already employed as such. So that the only permissible interpretation and rendering of the Hebrew sentence **אֲדֹנָיָה שְׁלַחַנִי אֵלֵיכֶם** is *'Ēhyèh hath sent me unto you*.

The case is different with regard to **אֲדֹנָיָה אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָיָה**. This expression necessarily constitutes a complete sentence, for it is all that follows the formula **וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל מֹשֶׁה**. As one single proper name, *'Ēhyèh-ashèr-'èhyèh*, it could constitute only one of two elements in the reply; another element, either a verb or a noun, would be required. We should have something like *'Ēhyèh-ashèr-'èhyèh hath sent thee*, or *'Ēhyèh-ashèr-'èhyèh is my name*, or *I am 'Ēhyèh-ashèr-'èhyèh*. As surely, then, as we must refrain from translating the word **אֲדֹנָיָה** in vs.<sup>14b</sup> must we face the problem of the interpretation of the sentence **אֲדֹנָיָה אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָיָה** in <sup>14a</sup>. Nor can the first element of the expression be constituted a proper name, while the remaining **אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָיָה** is treated as a

separate, subordinate clause explanatory of the name.<sup>20</sup> To say nothing of the intrinsic absurdity of explaining a word that needs no explanation by repeating that same word, or of the unnatural construction of **אשר** involved, the identical remarks apply to the simple **אֲדֹנָי** that have been passed upon **אֲדֹנָי אשר אֲדֹנָי** considered as a proper name: **אֲדֹנָי** alone cannot constitute the sentence demanded by the introductory formula **וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל מֹשֶׁה**.

What, then, is the meaning of the Hebrew sentence **אֲדֹנָי אשר אֲדֹנָי**?

The facts with regard to the literal rendering of this clause as Hebrew, no matter where or in what connection it might be found, were accurately set forth by Robertson Smith.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, recent commentators on the book of Exodus, and others who touch upon the subject, continue to tread, or to linger about, the path of error. A restatement of the case is therefore not uncalled for.

<sup>20</sup> So, after Ibn Ezra, Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*<sup>2</sup>, p. 72, note 2, "Bin — sintemal ich bin"; and after Wellhausen, Baentsch. Palpably absurd, however, the construction only becomes with the interpretation adopted by Marti, *Geschichte der israelitischen Religion*<sup>4</sup>, p. 61: "Ehje, das heisst *ich bin*," is what the author of Exodus 3<sup>14</sup> made God cause Moses to teach the Hebrew-speaking people.

<sup>21</sup> See *Prophets of Israel*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 386 ff. They were summed up, some 260 years before Robertson Smith, in the brief statement of Henry Ainsworth, "The Hebrew, *Ehjeah asher ehjeah*, properly signifieth, *I will be that I will be*," — *Annotations upon the second booke of Moses, called Exodus*, Reprint of 1639, p. 10 (first printed in 1617). Not so accurate, though possibly only because not so vague, are Luther and the Græcus Venetus.

Unfortunately, Robertson Smith acquiesced in the attribution of the expressions in question, together with the remainder of the section, to the original E source, and so was forced to twist his rendering into the requirements of the context, with the result that the substance of our passage is thus set forth: "The sense is . . . that what He will be to His people He will be, will approve Himself to be, without fail. The vagueness is inevitable, for no words can sum up all that Jehovah will be to His people; it is enough for them to know that He will be it (comp. Isa. lxiv. 3; Lam. iii. 23)." The unreality of this result is its sufficient condemnation.

Smith's conclusions had been previously published at greater length in an article "On the Name Jehovah (Jahve) and the Doctrine of Exodus III. 14," *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* for January, 1876, pp. 153 ff., at the close of which he connects **אֲדֹנָי** of Hosea 1<sup>9</sup> with this passage. His views were restated immediately thereafter by Nestle, *Die israelitischen Eigennamen*, 1876, pp. 91 ff.

The Hebrew verb **היה** does not mean *to have being*. The Greek rendering of **אֵלֶּה**, ὁ ὢν, introduces a concept as foreign to the Hebrew mind as it is to the Hebrew verb. The Hebrews, as such, never attained to the conception of a Universe (as distinguished from a World), or of Infinity, or of one First-cause, or of an underlying Substance or Reality; nor yet to that of the abstractest of them all, absolute and pure Being. Furthermore, the Hebrew verb **היה** does not mean *to exist*, except within certain limitations and in the French sense of the term. **היה** is *to come into existence, to happen, to occur; to become, to take on (an attribute), to enter upon (a state), to constitute (somewhat)*. Secondly, since *had become = was*, and *will become = will be*, and *having become = being* (Gerund), **היה** comes to be employed for *to be* in the sense of the *copula*, and even in the sense of *actuality*, but only with reference to past or future time or in speaking of the copulative relation or the predication itself; and it is so employed for the very reason that the Hebrew language ordinarily employs no verb at all to express the idea of being, and so cannot explicitly throw its thought into past or future time, or advert to the thought itself, without recourse to the verb *become*. Accordingly the Hebrew equivalent of *I exist*, if the occasion for such a declaration could be conceived of by the Hebrew mind, would be not **אֵלֶּה**, but **הִיִּיתִי** (Perfect), *I have come into existence and so am here*. On the other hand, *I am (something)* as distinguished from *I exist*, would not make use of the verb **היה** at all. *I am* can only be expressed by means of a nominal sentence. The Hebrew for *I am (so and so)* is **אֲנִי** followed by the predicate noun (or adverb). Thus the Hebrew for *I am that I am* is not **אֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר אֵלֶּה**, nor does it differ from that clause only in the matter of the tense of the verb. A nominal instead of a verbal sentence is required. The Hebrew for *I am that I am* is **אֲנִי אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי**, just as *I am he* is **אֲנִי הוּא**. The Imperfect **אֵלֶּה** can only mean *I am in the act of becoming*, or *I will become*, or *I will be*,<sup>22</sup> — which, in the looseness of Hebrew

<sup>22</sup> In order not to confuse the issue by distinctions of Mode foreign to the Hebrew, I adhere to the form of the English Future employed by Robertson Smith.

thinking, amount to pretty much the same thing. In no case can it be rendered *I am*. And while the thought *I will exist* (*abide, in the future*) would be theoretically possible in the latest stage of Old Testament writing, it is impossible in this connection, with the predicate **אשר אהיה** immediately following it. **אהיה** in this sentence can only mean *I will be* or *become* (*something*) ; for of course *I will be* or *become* (*somebody*) is not a sensible alternative. Not merely the most natural, then, but the necessary construction of **אהיה אשר אהיה** is *I will be what I will be*. So much for the literal meaning of the Hebrew clause.

We have still the question as to the idiomatic or logical value of this tautological expression. And only at this point is it pertinent to consider the testimony of the parallels from the Old Testament, Neo-Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic which are cited by Lagarde,<sup>23</sup> Robertson Smith,<sup>24</sup> and Grünbaum.<sup>25</sup> In doing so, the reader should bear in mind that no number of parallels from other languages can affect the meaning of the Hebrew verb as determined above. Our own detailed enumeration of the parallels may be safely and advantageously limited to those of the Old Testament ; there are enough of them to determine the point at issue, and we shall thereby escape the influence of any turns of thought which may be peculiar to later times and other languages. The Old Testament parallels adduced by the writers mentioned are : Gen. 43<sup>14</sup> Ex. 4<sup>13</sup> 16<sup>23</sup> 33<sup>19</sup> Deut. 9<sup>25</sup> 1 Sam. 1<sup>24</sup> 23<sup>13</sup> 2 Sam. 15<sup>20</sup> Ez. 12<sup>25</sup> Zech. 10<sup>8</sup> and Esther 4<sup>16</sup>, to which may be added 2 Kings 8<sup>1</sup>. Of these, 1 Sam. 1<sup>24</sup>, **והנער נער**, has nothing in common with the construction we are discussing. Neither has Zech. 10<sup>8</sup> **ורבו כמו רבו**, if the current interpretation, *They shall be as many as they formerly were*, is the proper one. Deut. 9<sup>25</sup> **ואתנפל לפני יהוה את ארבעים היום**, **ואת ארבעים הלילה אשר התנפלתי**, *And I prostrated myself before Jahweh the forty days and forty nights that I did*, is not exactly to the point, since there is nothing indefinite

<sup>23</sup> *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*, pp. 156 ff.

<sup>24</sup> *Prophets of Israel*<sup>2</sup>, p. 387.

<sup>25</sup> *ZDMG*, vol. xxxix, pp. 564 f.

about the complement of the verb.<sup>26</sup> The rest of the passages it will be convenient to cite in the following order: a) Passages with the Perfect in the relative clause: Gen. 43<sup>14</sup> **ואני כאשר שכלתני שלתי**, *And as for me, howsoever I must be bereaved, I shall be*; Esther 4<sup>16</sup> **וכאשר אכדתי אכדתי**, *And howsoever I must perish, I shall*. b) With the participle: 2 Sam. 15<sup>20</sup> **ואני הולך על אשר אני הולך**, (*Thou cam'st but yesterday, and shall I start thee traveling with us to-day,*) *with myself going where I am?* c) With the Imperfect in the relative clause: Ex. 4<sup>13</sup> **שלח נא ביד תשלח**, *Send by whatever hand thou chooseth*;<sup>27</sup> Ex. 16<sup>23</sup> **את אשר תאפו אפו ואת אשר תבשלו בשלו**, *Bake whatever ye choose, and boil whatever ye choose*; Ex. 33<sup>19</sup> **וחנתי את אשר אחן ורחמתי את אשר ארחם**, *I will be gracious unto whomsoever I choose, and I will have mercy upon whomsoever I choose*; 1 Sam. 23<sup>13</sup> **ויהלכו באשר**, *And they went roving wherever they chose*; 2 Kings 8<sup>1</sup> **וגורי באשר תגורי**, *And live temporarily wherever thou chooseth*; Ez. 12<sup>25</sup> **אדבר את אשר אדבר דבר**, *I will speak whatever word I choose*. From the data of the Old Testament it is evident that this indefinite tautological construction was employed by the Hebrews, in reference to an ensuing event, a) with the verb in the Perfect, to indicate the subject's subjection to a necessary though unknown fate, and b) with the verb in the Imperfect, to indicate the subject's absolute control of his own action: the idiomatic value of **הייתי אשר**, when spoken of future time, is *I shall be whatever I must*; the idiomatic value of **אדיה אשר אדיה**, which can be spoken only of future time, is *I will be whatever I choose*.

The language of Exodus 3<sup>14-15</sup> must accordingly be rendered as follows: <sup>14a</sup> *And God said unto Moses, I will be whatever I choose*. <sup>14b</sup> *And he said, Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel: 'Ēhyeh [אדיה = "I will be"] hath sent me unto you*. <sup>15</sup> *And God said further unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say*

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Deut. 29<sup>15</sup>; Steuernagel, *HK*, p. 34, seems not to perceive the difference between **יום ארבעים** and **את ארבעים היים**.

<sup>27</sup> That is, *by me, if thou wilt*; not "*durch irgend einen anderen*," as Kautzsch, § 155 n., and Baentsch. That the correct interpretation is hard to reconcile with the anger of Jahweh in verse 14 indicates only that the two verses are not from the same hand.

unto the children of Israel: *יְהוָה*, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you. — This is my name forever, and this my designation for generation after generation.

Now it will be immediately objected that this rendering of verse <sup>14</sup> yields no satisfactory sense, and is clearly out of harmony with the context. *I will be whatever I choose* not merely fails of constituting an adequate answer to the question propounded by Moses; it constitutes an entire change of subject, and actually assumes a question of a wholly different tenor. It is not the name, but the future of the Deity that is here the subject of speech. And though the latter subject is here mentioned for the first time, it is done with a tone of resentment and rebuke that implies inquisitive prying into that same subject on the part of somebody or other. *מה תהיה אשר אהיה* has in mind the query, *מה תהיה*, *What will you be?* Yet this query nowhere occurs, and the only occasion for asking it which appears in the whole course of the narrative is that furnished by the enigmatical, because unprecedented and catalectic, name *אֲהִיָּה*, bestowed upon the Deity in <sup>14b</sup>. We have here, then, the remarkable phenomenon of a supposed questioner being rebuked for impertinence and inquisitiveness before even the occasion for his question has been encountered. There is only one solution to this problem: *אֲהִיָּה אשר אהיה* of <sup>14a</sup> cannot have been written before *אֲהִיָּה* of <sup>14b</sup>; and since it does not follow that word in space, it must nevertheless have followed it in time; that is, <sup>14a</sup> IS AN INTERPOLATION. It is a Midrashic gloss on <sup>14b</sup>.

That <sup>14a</sup> is interpolated can be shown quite independently of the above considerations. Verse <sup>13</sup> asks a question. Not <sup>14a</sup> but <sup>14b</sup> answers the question, and that not only in substance, but — what is more to the point — in form. <sup>14b</sup> by its very language forces <sup>14a</sup> out of the text. The question of <sup>13</sup> is *מה אומר אלהם* *What shall I say unto them?* Not <sup>14a</sup> but <sup>14b</sup> it is that begins with the appropriate correlative *ויאמר כה תאמר לבני ישראל*.

Nor should it be imagined that the introductory *ויאמר* of <sup>14b</sup> is not weighty enough to introduce the reply of God to



Moses, and that something like the phrase "And God said unto Moses" of 14<sup>a</sup> is required. On the contrary, an immediate response by the other party to a dialogue is, if anything, more properly introduced by the simple וַיֹּאמֶר than by a more extended formula; cf. in particular, E in vss. 4. 6. 12 of this chapter and in Gen. 22<sup>1</sup>. 2. 7. 11. 12; and of passages which Steuernagel assigns to E<sup>2</sup>, Ex. 32<sup>18</sup> Num. 22<sup>30b</sup> 23<sup>12</sup>.

That vss. 14 and 15 are swollen has already been perceived. Others have objected to the recurrence of the introductory וַיֹּאמֶר thrice in connection with an uninterrupted utterance of Jahweh. The common remedy has been to exclude vs. 15 from the original text. It has been argued that the word עוֹד, which accompanies the introductory וַיֹּאמֶר in vs. 15, betrays the interpolation. To my mind, the word עוֹד, if it does anything, authenticates vs. 15. That verse contains an amplifying continuation of the statement made in 14<sup>b</sup>, and by means of the particle עוֹד it announces that it does so. וַיֹּאמֶר עוֹד does not mean *And he said again*, but *And he said further*, that is, *He went on to say*. Together with the following אֱלֹהִים אֵל מִשֶּׁה, it affords the necessary indication that the same person continues to speak who has just spoken; a mere וַיֹּאמֶר would have alternating reference. Nor is there any way by which the introduction of vs. 15 into our text can be explained, except to assume that it was part of the E document. Most scholars who exclude that verse assign it to Rje; one assigns it to Rd; and one to Rp. But a mere glance at vs. 16 shows that 15 cannot be the contribution of a redactor. Practically all of 15 is contained in 16, which latter belongs to J. Now, no redactor who had before him vs. 16 would of his own motion duplicate it with the verse immediately prefixed. The only way in which the presence of these two successive verses in this passage can be explained is by assuming that one of them came from one primary source, and the other from another primary source. Verse 15 cannot be from either Rje, Rd, or Rp, or from a later diaskeuast, but must have come in from the E document.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Wildeboer (*Die Litteratur des alten Testaments*, p. 138) suggested that vs. 15 can hardly belong to the E source, because it implies that the name

But if vs.<sup>15</sup> was in the E document, we have confirmation of the interpolation of <sup>14a</sup> in the particle עֹר. Perhaps we ought not to go so far as to say that עֹר could not possibly accompany the third of three occurrences of וַיֹּאמֶר and not the second, but such a style would certainly be most remarkable. That is, if <sup>14a</sup> were authentic, we should certainly have עֹר with the וַיֹּאמֶר of <sup>14b</sup>. Furthermore, as suggested above, simple וַיֹּאמֶר has alternating reference; so that <sup>14b</sup> must have been immediately preceded by an utterance of Moses, in the original source. We may confidently maintain that the introductory phraseology of <sup>14b</sup> and <sup>15</sup> is sufficient of itself to require the exclusion of <sup>14a</sup> from the text of E.

Before proceeding further, we may summarily dispose of the one remaining hypothesis regarding the conflation of vss.<sup>14-15</sup>, namely, that the entire vs.<sup>14</sup>, <sup>b</sup> as well as <sup>a</sup>, is interpolated or redactional.<sup>29</sup> The fatal objection to this hypothesis is that it creates vastly more difficulty than it removes. Upon that assumption, no part of the verse has any meaning whatever, and no possible ground for its insertion can be imagined.

Accordingly — disregarding for the moment the question

*Jahveh* was known to the Fathers, whereas P, who derived his notion from E, expressly makes the name to be revealed for the first time to Moses, the Fathers having known the Deity only by the name of *El Shaddai*. But both the name *El Shaddai* and the notion of the name *Jahveh* being here revealed for the first time (or indeed "revealed" at all) are peculiar to P. E furnished only the suggestion for the theory and practice of P. They occupy wholly different platforms. To P, it is the Deity revealing the most important of his attributes, his most holy name, to the favored of mankind; to E, it is the ancestral and national divinity — אֱלֹהִים, "deity" *par excellence* — appearing to Moses on a particular occasion and, upon request, making known his identity by means of his proper name. Even P could not get along with merely the appellative *Elohim* for the whole period before the final revelation. And it is doubtful if even P would have understood what Carpenter means by "the revelation of Elohim being followed by that of Yahweh" (*Composition of the Hexateuch*, p. 203). What then, to the mind of E, was the name by which the god of Moses' fathers, spoken of in vs.<sup>6</sup>, was alluded to in case of necessity, — by way of contrast to "the gods" (אֱלֹהִים) of Josh. 24<sup>2</sup>, for example? Or did he have no name?

<sup>29</sup> Carpenter and Harford assign it to Rje.

of the authenticity of the name אֱלֹהִים in <sup>14b</sup> — the text of E ran as follows :

“<sup>13</sup> And Moses said unto God, Behold I come unto the children of Israel and say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you. Then will they say unto me, What is his name? What shall I say unto them? <sup>14b</sup> And he said, Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel: אֱלֹהִים hath sent me unto you. <sup>15</sup> And God said further unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel: יְהוָה, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you.” Etc.

It is with this determination of the text that we must consider the question of the authenticity of the reading אֱלֹהִים in <sup>14b</sup>. We have seen that this reading is older than <sup>14a</sup> and occasioned the latter's interpolation. How old is the reading? Does it go back to E? With <sup>14a</sup> out of the way, there can be no manner of doubt that אֱלֹהִים of <sup>14b</sup> represents the corruption of an original יְהוָה.<sup>30</sup> The name of Israel's God was not אֱלֹהִים, but יְהוָה. The name which from this point on appears from time to time in the E document is not אֱלֹהִים, but יְהוָה. The name which still stands in vs.<sup>15</sup>, the author's own amplification of the statement of <sup>14b</sup>, is יְהוָה. Furthermore, it is universally admitted that the E document, with its introduction of the proper name of the God of Israel at this point in the history, furnished the model for the procedure, and gave occasion for the theory, of the later priestly writer, who introduced the name יְהוָה in a special revelation to Moses in the passage preserved at Ex. 6<sup>2</sup>, and who from that point on employed the name with greater uniformity than does the E document. The name which was disclosed to Moses at this point in the E narrative, as the writer of P understood it, was not אֱלֹהִים, but יְהוָה. Nor does P know anything of the disclosure of some explanation or origin of the name, besides the name itself. Of these

<sup>30</sup> So already Holzinger (*Exodus*, in *KHC*, p. 14), but on radically different and entirely erroneous grounds. Cf. also Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*<sup>2</sup>, p. 72, note 2.

facts there can be no doubt whatever. So that the E document (or, if we prefer, the E passage in the JE document), as P had it, read at this point the name יהוה and no other. אלהי has, therefore, been substituted for an original יהוה in the text of <sup>14b</sup>, and the substitution took place after P, — or at any rate, in a manuscript which did not influence the text P used. Certainly the reading אלהי, if it existed anywhere, was not at all current in P's day; for it is not one which could long remain unnoticed, — witness the interpolation of <sup>14a</sup>. When, moreover, we consider that *our* E (or JE) comes to us from the same priestly circles in which P arose, the conclusion that אלהי was not introduced into the text of E until after P was written, becomes all but necessary. On the whole, I think it will not be disputed that we are justified in maintaining that, on the evidence of P, the reading אלהי for יהוה in the passage which now constitutes Ex. 3<sup>14b</sup> was not in existence about the beginning of the fifth century B.C.

On the other hand, our study of the history of the text has shown that, on the evidence of all the versions and the Samaritan tradition, the reading אלהי was prevalent some considerable time before the middle of the third century B.C. And even disregarding the Samaritan tradition entirely, on account of the uncertainty which attaches to the chronological value of its testimony, the mere fact that Alexandrian Greek and Masoretic Hebrew of Ex. 3<sup>14</sup> derive from a common ancestor, requires us to push the date of the present reading in <sup>14b</sup> appreciably to the rear of the middle of the third century B.C. So that the *terminus ante quem* may in any event be safely set down as about the end of the fourth century. Some time between 500 and 300 B.C., then, אלהי was substituted for יהוה in the text of Ex. 3<sup>14b</sup>. A more precise determination of the date of this substitution cannot be reached without concerning ourselves with the question of the reason for it.

That there was a reason for it, and that the alteration of the text was the result of design and not the result of accident, cannot be doubted. For assuming — what seems quite

impossible — that a scribe did actually slip into reading or writing אלהי for the name of the national God in copying a manuscript, the slip could not fail of unceremonious correction upon the very first reading of his copy, since the strangeness of the text must have compelled attention, and any scruples about correcting so palpable a blunder could have been summarily removed by a glance at another manuscript. In fact, so great must have been the temptation to correct the reading אלהי, that we may question whether, in spite of the deliberate intent which marked its introduction, it would have survived, had it not been hedged about by the interpolated אלהי אשר אלהי which followed hard upon its heels, not improbably with that very danger in view.<sup>31</sup>

The motive for the alteration of the name יהוה to אלהי in Exodus 314<sup>b</sup> is not far to seek. It can have been only one: to prevent the utterance of the ineffable name.

The increasing awe with which, under the influence of the Priest Code and the accomplished centralization of the cultus, all things came to be regarded that pertained to the person of the holy God, resulted, toward the end of the period whose bounds we have determined (500–300 B.C.), in the entire abandonment of the public use of his most holy Name

<sup>31</sup> A somewhat similar, though inverted, case of one corruption of the text following upon another from much the same motive as here, is that which continues to perplex critics in 1 Sam. 313. There the original reading was that which I append (in the larger type):

והגדתי לו כי שפט אני  
את ביתו עד עולם  
נעון אשר ידע כי מקללים [א]להי[ן]  
בניו ולא כחה בם

The words printed in small type, *on account of the sin which need not be mentioned* (literally, *which he knows*), were put upon the margin to be substituted for the blasphemous expression בניי מקללים אלהים in reading the text aloud. But being written into the column in a later manuscript, their object was defeated, and the old difficulty had to be met again, this time by truncating אלהים to להם, the present Masoretic text, which is opposed alike by the Alexandrian Greek and by the Rabbinical tradition. The Greek ἐν ἀδικίαις ὡς αὐτοῦ preserves a different form of the marginal euphemism = בעון בניי.

outside of the one central sanctuary at Jerusalem. It was no longer the name of a national divinity, acquaintance with which was as old as the relation to the person bearing it. It was the very real name of the God of all the world, like his holy Law by special act of grace revealed to Moses for the salvation of his people. Before yet they had built a fence of tradition about the written law to prevent any approximation to the violation of its precepts, the Jews ceased to utter the divine name, lest they approach ever so remotely the bounds of sacrilege.<sup>32</sup> The mere utterance of the name, apart from perjury, cursing, or blasphemy, was indeed at no time a criminal offense; <sup>33</sup> but it soon came to be considered a ritual sin, punishable by God though not by man.<sup>34</sup> And though this sin, like other sins, was no doubt sometimes committed, it was not a thing to be authorized or tolerated in connection with the Sabbath functions of the synagogue.

From the statements of Philo and Josephus it is evident that the practical disuse of the name יהוה lay so far behind them that they had not the slightest idea that there ever was a time when the name was less sparingly employed than in their own days.<sup>35</sup> In some of the later writings of the Old

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Der Gottesname Adonai und seine Geschichte*, pp. 71 f. Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes*, Berlin, 1903, p. 166, goes altogether too far when he carries this attitude back to the days of Ezekiel.

<sup>33</sup> According to *b. Aboda Zara* 17 b, under Roman rule in the second century A.D. Rabbi Hanina ben Teradion was burned at the stake, his wife executed, and his daughter condemned to a life of shame, for no other cause than that the Rabbi had pronounced the ineffable name in public hearing. But the ground alleged for the outrage is rejected even by those who accept as historical all the other details of the Talmudic story; cf. Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten*, vol. i. p. 400.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, x. 1; Tosefta, *Sanh.* xii. 9 (ed. Zuckermann, p. 433). In Mishna, *Berachoth*, ix. 5, there is no talk of the utterance of the word יהוה. The question there is merely whether one shall or shall not use the divine name in ordinary salutation (שאל את שלום). The salutations יהוה עמכם, יהוה עמך, יהוה עמי, of Ruth 2<sup>4</sup> and Judges 6<sup>12</sup> (which were, as a matter of course, pronounced by the speakers ארני עמכם, ארני עמך, etc.) are cited by those who prefer the good old religious forms — "Despise not thy mother when she is old" is quoted from Proverbs 23<sup>22</sup> — to the godless שלום עליכם of their own unregenerate days.

<sup>35</sup> Dalman, *l.c.* pp. 38, 42.

Testament — Chronicles, Daniel, Ecclesiastes, and an entire section of the Psalms — there is a marked avoidance of the name יהוה. This is, to be sure, of itself not very significant, except as it indicates the increasing preference for the term אלהים. It furnishes no evidence that when encountered or employed by these Old Testament writers, the name יהוה was not faithfully pronounced. Then, too, we know that in still later times יהוה, though never pronounced, was unhesitatingly written. But a comparison of Chronicles with the book of Samuel makes it almost certain that the Chronicler, at least, pronounced אדני even when he did write יהוה; for in reproducing his source he deliberately avoids the combination יהוה אדני of 2 Sam. 7 (which to him would have been אדני אדני<sup>36</sup>), writing for it now יהוה אלהים, now אלהים, now יהוה, and never once does he write אדני.<sup>37</sup> The most valuable and conclusive evidence, however, regarding the avoidance of the utterance of the name יהוה, is that furnished by the Alexandrian Greek version. By the time of the first translation of the Pentateuch into Greek, in the middle of the third century B.C., the custom of substituting another word for the proper name of the Deity in the reading of the Law was already firmly established, and the substitute employed was stereotyped and uniform. For there ought to be no doubt whatever that the word *Kύριος* was habitually employed by the readers of the Greek version, from the very first, wherever the original had יהוה,<sup>38</sup> and that this usage was derived from the settled custom among the Palestinian Jews of pronouncing the name אדני. Dalman<sup>39</sup> affirms that the *Kύριος* of our Greek manuscripts cannot be received as evidence for the early oral substitution of אדני for יהוה, since from the statements of Origen<sup>40</sup> and Jerome<sup>41</sup> it appears that

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Kittel, *PRE<sup>3</sup>*, vol. viii. p. 532.

<sup>37</sup> See Jacob, *l.c.* pp. 165 f.

<sup>38</sup> The few occurrences of יהוה אדני in the Pentateuch were variously treated in the Greek and may be disregarded.

<sup>39</sup> *l.c.* pp. 37 f.

<sup>40</sup> On Psalm 2, Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, xii. 1104.

<sup>41</sup> *Prologus galeatus*, and in the letter to Marcella referred to above, p. 121, note 17.

old Greek manuscripts exhibited the Hebrew characters יְהוָה, and not the Greek *Kýrios*, wherever the proper name occurred in the original. Assuming, however, that the statements of Origen and Jerome justify the inference that the original Greek manuscript did, like Aquila's version, employ that device (against which inference not a little might be said<sup>42</sup>), the fact remains that Hebrew יְהוָה in a Greek manuscript is as good evidence for the custom of substituting something or other for the authentic word as would be the reading *Kýrios* itself. Otherwise the Greek would have exhibited not the Hebrew characters, but the transliteration of the name in Greek characters, as in the case of other proper names;<sup>43</sup> and neither in extant Greek manuscripts nor in tradition is there the faintest trace of an original *Iavḡ* (or variant of it)<sup>44</sup> in the Greek version. But if the Hellenistic Jews from the very beginning substituted some word for יְהוָה in reading the Greek text, (1) we may be certain that it was the custom of the contemporary Palestinian Jews to do likewise in reading the Hebrew, and (2) we have no reason in the world for believing that the word which the Hellenistic Jews originally substituted was different from that which we find them automatically employing in the days of Philo, namely *Kýrios*. But if *Kýrios* was employed for יְהוָה among the Hellenistic Jews from the earliest times, אֲדֹנָי must have been antecedently so employed by the Palestinian Jews; for *Kýrios*<sup>45</sup> obviously reproduces the suffixless sense which אֲדֹנָי acquired — as Dalman himself has so ably shown — in the very act of being substituted for the name יְהוָה.

At least as early as 300 B.C., then, and most probably earlier, the utterance of the name יְהוָה was abandoned in the

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Kittel, *l.c.* pp. 530, 532.

<sup>43</sup> It would hardly have been bold enough to attempt a translation.

<sup>44</sup>  $\bar{a}$  (= אָ =  $\bar{e}$ ) is in Hebrew a phase of  $a$ , whereas in Greek it is a phase of  $\epsilon$ ; hence *Μωυσης* and *Μαρασση*. (Participles of לִיָּה verbs had doubtless ceased to be pronounced אָ by that time.) In later times, when  $\eta$  had become  $\hat{i}$  and  $\beta$  had become  $v$ , we have *Iaβe* (Epiphanius and Theodoret). Origen's *Iavḡ* probably omits the consonantal  $\bar{v}$ ; he certainly does not intend אָ.

<sup>45</sup> Notice that it is not  $\delta$  *Kýrios*, which is of secondary development.



Jewish synagogue. I say most probably earlier; for the phenomenon ought not to be isolated, and it will best be connected with the institutional innovations which followed immediately upon the publication and circulation of the Pentateuch.<sup>46</sup>

It was of course only in reading or quoting verbatim a writing which contained the name that a vocal device for the avoidance of its utterance would ordinarily be required. When one speaks of the God of the whole world as "God," one is not employing a surrogate for יהוה. A speaker would have no difficulty in leaving the name alone; the person of the Deity could be referred to in many other ways. And the Palestinian Jews, in their own utterances, did leave alone not only יהוה, but אדני too, when once the latter had become the synagogue surrogate for יהוה. On the other hand, mere reference to the *name* יהוה, though it would often occur, did not involve the quotation of the name. This distinction between reference to the person and reference to the vocable is important. In Lev. 24<sup>11, 16</sup> בנקבו שם and ויקב את השם are correlatives of נקב שם יהוה, not — it is to be noticed — of נקב יהוה.<sup>47</sup> Doubtless along this line lay the demarcation between the original use of אדני on the one hand, and of השם on the other, as surrogates for יהוה. The two terms may have been in part suggested, as Dalman observes,<sup>48</sup> by the existing phrases אדני יהוה and שם יהוה, — though it would

<sup>46</sup> The synagogue may have had its prototype among the learned in the Exile, but the institution itself is not to be dissociated from the Five Books of Moses. Cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*<sup>3</sup>, vol. ii. pp. 428 ff.

<sup>47</sup> Geiger's view (*Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 274) that שם is the result of corruption of the text in all three cases, is not at all plausible. He makes the point that נקב is never employed with שם of the person cursed. But this begs the question at issue. The story of Lev. 24<sup>10</sup> ff., if it means anything, means that the contentious half-breed blasphemed by making use of the name יהוה in cursing his antagonist. It is quite true that "השם ganz absolut für Gott zu setzen, ist durchaus unbiblisch." The conclusion is that it stands for God's name. The final בנקבו שם of v. 16, without the article, for so soon as he employs the name (already mentioned, and scil. in cursing) is not un-Hebraic. נקב in this section may very well be literally to pronounce, and yet the burden of the section be a law against blasphemy only; cf. Dalman. *l.c.* p. 44.

<sup>48</sup> *l.c.* p. 74.

seem that a suggestion for the use of **השם** in referring to "the name" was superfluous. But that the terms were logically interchangeable, or that the Jews in early times were guilty of the absurd Samaritan custom of reading **השם** where the person of the Deity is spoken of—even invoked—in the Old Testament, as Geiger maintained,<sup>49</sup> is not to be believed. Geiger says of the Talmudic evidence which opposes his view, "Erst spät (*j. Sanh.* 10, 1 [28 *b*], *b. Pessachim* 50 *a*, *Kidd.* 71 *a*) tritt die bestimmte Angabe auf, dass zwar **יהוה** geschrieben, aber **אדני** gelesen werde." But more telling than any "bestimmte Angabe" is the quiet implication of age-long usage involved in the following passage of the Jerusalem Talmud (*Megilla* 71 *d*): **אילו שמות שאין נמחקין הכותב את השם בארבע אותיות ב"י ודא בא"לף ובד"לת . אל . אלהים . וגי**. *These are the names which may not be erased: When one writes out the Name with four letters* (that is, does not write **ה**, for example), *and that whether with Yodh He* (that is, writing **יהוה**) *or with Aleph Daleth* (writing **אדני**); **אל**; **אלהים**; etc.<sup>50</sup> The Mishnic passages cited by Dalman,<sup>51</sup> *Yoma*, iii. 8, iv. 2, vi. 2, in which the High Priest is represented as addressing the Deity at the opening of his confessional prayer on the Day of Atonement with **אנא השם**, can scarcely mean anything but that the name **יהוה** was actually uttered by the High Priest, as Geiger was the first to admit.<sup>52</sup> Later, in the scholasticism of the Rabbis, the use of **השם** was doubtless somewhat extended. Yet it is hard to believe that even in the third or fourth century A.D. the

<sup>49</sup> *l.c.* pp. 262 ff. For the rest, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the Samaritan custom of substituting **השם** for **יהוה** in the reading of the Law—which custom seems not to have controlled the practice in every-day life—is of relatively late date, at the most no older than the Dosithean movement and the temporary *rapprochement* between Jews and Samaritans in the early part of the second century A.D. (cf. Hamburger, *Real-encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, part ii. p. 1069). In that case we can understand the failure of the Samaritans to adopt a surrogate which to their Jewish mentors had long since become a proper name and grown almost as sacred as **יהוה** itself.

<sup>50</sup> This passage is mistranslated by Schwab, *Le Talmud de Jérusalem*, vol. vi. p. 218.

<sup>51</sup> *Worte Jesu*, p. 150.

<sup>52</sup> *l.c.* p. 263.

High Priest, had there been one, would have addressed the Deity as **השם**.<sup>53</sup> Possibly enough the rehearser of the Mishna may have substituted **השם** in relating the tradition. But we cannot be sure of it. For this term was certainly sometimes set down in manuscripts, both in Scripture citations and otherwise, when some more construable surrogate was actually spoken, merely to steer clear of the rule against the erasure of divine names, or to avoid the confusion of a less obvious written surrogate. The purport of this will appear more clearly as we proceed.

To return now to the expression **אדירה** in Ex. 31<sup>4b</sup>. We said that this word represents the wilful alteration of original **יהוה**, and that the purpose of the alteration can only have been to prevent the utterance of the ineffable name. If our conclusion is justified, the alteration will fall into the period when the custom of avoiding the utterance of **יהוה** by the substitution of **אדני** was being inaugurated in the Jewish synagogue, sometime between the publication of the Pentateuch and the end of the fourth century B.C.

It needs little argument to show that an exceptional procedure in the case of the divine name in Ex. 31<sup>4b</sup>, both as to the character of the surrogate employed and as to the projection of the surrogate into the text itself, was literally unavoidable.

The second of these points may be first disposed of. A simple rule to read **אדני** uniformly wherever **יהוה** was encountered in the text, required no manuscript notation in order to be remembered and obeyed. But an isolated divergence from the uniform practice, in connection with a particular passage, could hardly be trusted to the memory at a time when as yet the perfect mastery of the entire text of the Law was not a common feat. If it can be shown that an exceptional surrogate was required in this passage, I think it will not be disputed that its projection into the text was equally necessary.

<sup>53</sup> It is needless to say that the Jews did not hypostatize the name of God. Giesebrecht, *Die alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens*, p. 44, has overworked the passages Ex. 23<sup>21</sup> and Isa. 30<sup>27</sup>.

Now it is to be noticed that Ex. 3<sup>14b</sup> is the one passage in the Pentateuch where the substitution of אֲדֹנִי for יְהוָה was not merely glaringly inappropriate, but actually impossible. It is the one passage where the question, "What is the proper name of Israel's God?" having been formally asked is formally answered. Ex. 6<sup>2 f.</sup> is far from being in the same case. Even to us who read the latter passage as part of the separate P document, its burden is manifestly not the identity of the name but the age of its revelation to mankind. We must not forget, however, that we are dealing with readers of the Pentateuch, not of the P document. To one who had perused or listened to the account of Ex. 3<sup>13 ff.</sup>, the phrase אֲנִי יְהוָה of Ex. 6<sup>2</sup> could no more savor of a revelation of that name to Moses than would the several recurrences of that expression in the ensuing section or in the Holiness Code. To the mind of such a person, the statement of Ex. 6<sup>2 f.</sup> could do no more than inform Moses that the name, which he (as well as the reader) already knew, was not known of old to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. These, he is told, knew the Deity only by the name אֱלֹהֵי שָׂרָי. The question of the identity of the antithetical term was not raised, though that term was formally alluded to. The pronunciation שְׁמִי יְהוָה for שְׁמִי אֲדֹנִי of 6<sup>3</sup> introduced, it is true, an unmistakable solecism, but only an incidental one, such as occurred often enough elsewhere,—in Lev. 24<sup>16</sup> for example. On the other hand, to permit the use of אֲדֹנִי in Ex. 3<sup>14b</sup> in direct response to the question מִה שְׁמִי of vs.<sup>13</sup>, would have been to authorize an out and out, as well as a perilous, misstatement. When once the question had been squarely answered, the reader might be permitted to return to the customary אֲדֹנִי in vs.<sup>15</sup>, but the immediate response of vs.<sup>14</sup> could not employ it. The institutors of the custom of substituting אֲדֹנִי for the written יְהוָה in the reading of the Law desired to prevent the utterance of the sacred name; but they were very far from desiring to mislead the congregation into the belief that the word אֲדֹנִי, which was constantly heard in the lections, was itself the holy and ineffable name. Yet to

prescribe the use of אֲדֹנָי, in Ex. 3<sup>14b</sup> would be to encourage, if not indeed to confirm, such a belief; to put the case mildly, its effect would be to confuse the public mind. Nor, for the same reason, could any more general designation of the Deity do duty here. And to cause Moses to answer the question מֶה שְׁמוֹ with הַשֵּׁם שְׁלֹחֲנִי would be quite too absurd for the people of the times, though perhaps not for some of us. Here, for once, the utterance of the name יְהוָה could not be avoided.

Yet if the sacredness of the name was to be violated once periodically in every synagogue in the land, why not oftener, and elsewhere? In this situation there was but one alternative—an alternative that we shall see was habitually resorted to during the following centuries in similar case outside of the synagogue. It was to so mutilate the word in pronouncing it that the requirement of the rule against its utterance would be formally met, while at the same time what was actually uttered could not possibly be mistaken for anything but the representation of the tetragrammaton. This was habitually done in later times by exchanging one or two of the consonants of the sacred name, while maintaining intact its syllabic and vocalic cast. The term for this hybrid product in the Hebrew of the Rabbis was כְּנוֹי. The word אֲדֹנָי in Ex. 3<sup>14b</sup> is a כְּנוֹי of יְהוָה.

Unfortunately the statement of fact contained in the last paragraph is in need of demonstration. The Rabbinical term כְּנוֹי is not ordinarily assigned this meaning when used in connection with a designation of the Deity, and it is far from being commonly admitted that the Jews in early times were accustomed to avoid the actual pronunciation of the divine name, in case of need, by means of this mechanical device.

The definition of כְּנוֹי given by Levy is "Beiname, Nebenbenennung";<sup>54</sup> by Jastrow, "by-name, surname, attribute, substituted word";<sup>55</sup> by Bacher, "eine umschreibende Benennung, im Gegensatz zum eigentlichen Namen Gottes, dem

<sup>54</sup> *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, vol. ii. pp. 350 f.

<sup>55</sup> *Dictionary of the Targumim*, etc., p. 633.

Tetragrammaton";<sup>56</sup> by Dalman, "Beiname, umschreibende Benennung."<sup>57</sup> None of these is a strictly accurate definition of the term כְּנוֹי.

Not a little confusion has been wrought in this matter by the repeated citation of the Arabic كُنْيَة, which has been customarily rendered "Beiname," "ehrendes Epitheton." But this rendering of the Arabic term is by no means comprehensive enough, and in any case not quite legitimate. *Surname* is only a secondary and applied meaning of كُنْيَة; and it is not even that, if we emphasize the prefix. The Arabic word properly means *surrogate*, and is primarily employed to designate a term which affects to veil an indecent or otherwise objectionable allusion. It then comes to be employed for any circumlocutory designation; and so passes at last to the stereotyped *surrogates* of individual names, such as *Abu Zaid*, "the Father of Zaid." But only in so far as such a designation is obviously used to the exclusion of the man's real name is it a كُنْيَة. Whether a word (which need not necessarily be a substantive) or a phrase is or is not a كُنْيَة depends upon its function and not upon its form; and the same element may be a كُنْيَة in one connection and not in another. To illustrate with a familiar case, "Peter" in the expression "Simon Peter" is a surname, but not a كُنْيَة, which it might be if used in avoidance of the name Simon.<sup>58</sup> For the rest, there can be little doubt that the root of the word is cognate to כָּן, *to disguise or conceal*.

The technical Neo-Hebrew word כְּנוֹי (frequently written כִּנּוּי) is a *nomen actionis* of Piel כָּנָה, like דַּבֵּר utterance, from דָּבַר *to utter*; חֲדָשׁ innovation, from חָדַשׁ *to innovate*; רְבִיז inclusion, from רָבַד *to include*; מְעִיט exclusion, from מָצַט *to exclude*; פְּרוּשׁ the act of being exact (in expression),

<sup>56</sup> *Terminologie der Tannaiten*, p. 85.

<sup>57</sup> *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Wörterbuch*, p. 192.

<sup>58</sup> See *Lisân ul 'Arab*, vol. xx. pp. 98 f. The lexicon of Golius (Leyden, 1653) defined the Arabic verb, "Appellavit sive signavit nomine per se significante rem aliam;" and the noun, "Metonymia, quum alio quàm suo nomine significatur res."

*specification*, from פָּרַשׁ *to be exact, to specify*. There is no question about the meaning of the Piel בָּנָה. It is defined by Bacher, "auf verhüllende Weise ausdrücken, umschreiben."<sup>59</sup> The *nomen actionis* of this is accordingly, *the act of expressing-in-disguise*; which is the primary meaning of בָּנוֹי. This primary meaning is unmistakably retained in the Mishnic Text of *Tamid* vii. 2 (= *Sota* vii. 6), בְּמִקְדָּשׁ הָיוּ אוֹמְרִים, אֵת הַשֵּׁם כְּכַתְּבוֹ וּבְמִדִּינָה בְּכַנּוּיָּו *In the sanctuary they (the priests) were accustomed to pronounce the Name (in benediction, Num. 6<sup>24</sup> ff.) as it is written; in the town (that is, when they were abroad in the city of Jerusalem), by disguising it.*<sup>60</sup>

Now just as our English word "expression" and the Neo-Hebrew word דְּבוּר, from meaning originally *the act of expressing*, come to mean *the thing expressed*, so בָּנוֹי, from meaning *the act of expressing-in-disguise*, comes to mean *that which expresses-in-disguise*; or—to employ another term—from meaning *substitution* in the sense of *the act of substitut-*

<sup>59</sup> *l.c.* p. 83; cf. Levy, *s.v.* It is the word which recurs at the end of each article in the enumeration of the eighteen *Tiqqune Soferim* or euphemistical alterations of the Old Testament text recorded in the Jewish tradition: אֵלָא שְׂכִינָה הַכְּתוּב, *but the text disguises*; see Geiger, *Urschrift*, pp. 308 ff.; Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, p. 348.

<sup>60</sup> "Hier bedeutet בָּנוֹי seine — des Tetragrammatons — umschreibende Lesung אֵרֶן," says Bacher, after he has defined בָּנוֹי as "eine umschreibende Benennung [of God]." But, with all due respect to the commentators of the Middle Ages, how do we know that the Mishna has reference to אֵרֶן? The ordinary assumption is that by בְּמִדִּינָה is meant, "when the priests are officiating in the synagogues of the country," in which case it is taken for granted they would make use of the synagogue surrogate of the name יְהוָה. But what evidence have we that the priests in their official capacity had anything to do with the functions of the synagogue, or that they were employed to "pronounce the benediction" there? The common residence of the priests was Jerusalem, and when the text speaks of the priests doing one thing in the מִקְדָּשׁ and another in the מִדִּינָה, we have no reason for rendering otherwise than *in the temple* and *in the town* respectively. Nor can we render בָּנוֹי of this passage *its* (the name's) *surrogate*; for there never was a time when the name יְהוָה had only one בָּנוֹי, — decidedly not in the Mishnic period; cf. *Shebu'oth* iv. 13, *Sanhedrin* vii. 5. For the rest, it is important to notice that in the one passage where בָּנוֹי occurs with the possessive suffix of the third person singular, the supporters of the prevalent erroneous definition of the word are forced to admit that the suffix has reference to the name and not to the person of God.

ing, it comes to mean *substitution* in the sense of *the thing substituted*, — *surrogate*. These two senses, however, exhaust the lexical values of the word כְּנוֹי.<sup>61</sup> Any narrower definition of the word involves “false distribution.”

Moreover, exactly as in the case of the Arabic term, whether a word or phrase is or is not a כְּנוֹי depends upon its function in actual use and in the conception of the speaker, and not at all upon its identity. One cannot affirm of any particular word in the lexicon that it is *per se* a כְּנוֹי. According to the commentary on Leviticus called *Sifra* (ed. Weiss, fol. 104 c), the text of Lev. 24<sup>11</sup> does not substitute וַיִּכְרֹךְ for וַיִּקְלֵל as does the text of 1 Kings 21<sup>13</sup>, בָּרַךְ נְבוֹת אֱלֹהִים וּמֶלֶךְ, for the reason that “they do not put to death on the basis of a כְּנוֹי” (M. *Sanhedrin* vii. 5). That is, the verb בָּרַךְ when employed as a euphemistic substitute for וַיִּקְלֵל is a כְּנוֹי. So the expression הַמָּקוֹם, *the place*, may be a כְּנוֹי of the word אֱלֹהִים; and אֱלֹהִים in turn may be conceived of as a כְּנוֹי of the name יְהוָה.<sup>62</sup> After what has been said, it is needless to

<sup>61</sup> I refer, of course, to early times; by the grammarians of the Middle Ages the word is used for “pronoun”; cf. Buxtorf-Fischer, *s.v.* In Arabic grammar كُنَايَة is not exactly “pronoun” (as Caspari-Müller, § 34); the class consists of “certains mots d’une signification vague qu’on substitue à des expressions plus déterminées”; see De Sacy, *Grammaire arabe*,<sup>2</sup> vol. i. pp. 430, 434, vol. ii. p. 66; and cf. Wright-DeGoeje, *Arabic Grammar*, vol. ii. p. 125 C.

<sup>62</sup> In *Sifra*, on Lev. 19<sup>12</sup> (88 c), 24<sup>11</sup> (104 d), and in both Talmuds (*b. Sanhedrin* 56 a, *j. Sanhedrin* 25 a), all designations of the Deity other than יְהוָה are classed together as הַכְּנוּיִים, but that is merely in maintenance of the fiction that all other designations are but *surrogates* of the real name. So according to *b. Sanhedrin* 60 a, when the heathen Eglon, king of Moab, hears from Ehud אֵלֶיךָ לִי אֱלֹהִים דִּבֶּר he hears only a כְּנוֹי. In the Mishna כל הַכְּנוּיִים is used very differently (*She’buoth* iv. 13): (When witnesses are summoned with any of the expressions) “*I adjure you*,” “*I enjoin upon you*,” “*I bind you*,” they are obligated: (if the adjuration be) by “heaven” or by “earth,” they are free; (but if) by “Aleph Daleth” [that is, referring to אֲדָנִי, but avoiding its pronunciation in this manner], by “Yodh He” [with similar reference to יְהוָה, by שְׂרֵי, by צִבְאוֹת, by וְרִחוּם, חֲנִן [Ex. 34<sup>6</sup>], by אֲפִים אֲרַךְ, by חֶסֶד, by רַב, or by any of the surrogates (וְכָל הַכְּנוּיִין), they are obligated. Whatever may have been the character of the “surrogates” alluded to, there is nothing in the Mishnic text to show that they were like רַב חֶסֶד and the two preceding expressions. The interpretations “oder bei



point out that the noun כְּנוֹי stands in no particular relation to the designation of the Deity, any more than does the verb כָּנָה.

We said that one cannot affirm of any word in the lexicon that it is or is not *per se* a כְּנוֹי. But there are certain vocabularies which have no place in the lexicon, of which this may be affirmed. These are meaningless aggregations of letters, which never perform any other office than that of serving as surrogates for other words. We may illustrate with Scotch and American "by gosh" for "by God"; this "gosh" is a כְּנוֹי in its own right. It is these כְּנוֹיִים of the "dummy" order, of which the Rabbinical literature has an abundant supply, that concern us particularly here.

We may limit our quotations to the two important passages of the Mishna, *Nedarim* i. 1, 2, and *Sanhedrin* vii. 5. The first will exhibit the manner in which these surrogates are formed by the mutilation of the word they replace, that is, by the change of certain of its consonants while preserving intact its syllabic and vocalic cast,<sup>63</sup> and will tell us explicitly that such formations are כְּנוֹיִים. The second passage will show that the name יהוה yielded surrogates for itself in precisely the same manner.

As the extremely condensed form of part of *Nedarim* i. 1, 2, makes a literal translation impossible, I quote the Hebrew: (1) כָּל כְּנוֹיֵי נִדְרִים כְּנִדְרִים וְחֲרָמִים כְּחֲרָמִים וְשְׁבוּעוֹת כְּשְׁבוּעוֹת וְנִזְיוֹת כְּנִזְיוֹת. . . . (2) הָאוֹמֵר לְחֻבְרוֹ קוֹנֵם קוֹנֵם הָרִי אֵלּוֹ כְּנוֹיִין לְחֻרָם נֹיֵק נִזִּחַ פּוֹיחַ הָרִי אֵלּוֹ כְּנוֹיִין לְנִזְיוֹת שְׁבוּעָה שְׁקוּקָה נִדֵּר בְּמוֹתָא הָרִי אֵלּוֹ כְּנוֹיִין לְשְׁבוּעָה. That is, *All the surrogates employed in vows are as binding as the words they displace, likewise all those employed in bans, all those employed in oaths, and all*

*sonst einem der Attribute*" (Hoffmann), and "oder bei allen *anderen* Attributen" (Goldschmidt), both read the Babylonian Gemara (which itself confuses two entirely different principles) into the Mishna.

<sup>63</sup> Any disturbance of the vocalic cast of the word, in addition to the exchange of its consonants, renders it unrecognizable, and relegates it to the class of the כְּנוֹיִין כְּנוֹיִי, *surrogates of surrogates*, which are rejected by one school of Tannaites as beyond the pale of "Hebrew"; cf. b. *Nedarim* 10 b, j. *Nazir* 51 d.



*the basis of the surrogate. But they caused everybody not concerned to leave the room, and asked the most prominent among the witnesses, saying to him, Repeat exactly (בְּפִרְיֵשׁ) what thou didst hear. This he did. Then the judges rose to their feet and rent their garments, and never mended them thereafter.<sup>68</sup> And the second witness said, I too heard as he did. And the third said, I too heard as he did.*

I have left the vocable יוֹסֵה unpointed in both cases, because that is the way it was written, and the traditional pronunciation of it is neither here nor there. The vocalization is the vocalization of יְהוֹה, which tradition has failed to transmit. The reading יוֹסֵה is that of the Jerusalem Talmud and is commonly admitted to be the original; the Babylonian Talmud has יוֹסִי, which is manifestly a later conformation of the spelling to the familiar Rabbinical name יוֹסִי, *Jose*, the hypocoristic form of יוֹסֵף, *Joseph*. יוֹסֵה is also the reading in the text of *Sifra* (104c). The words יְהוֹה אֵת יוֹסֵה, which I have construed as two separate examples, יְהוֹה יוֹסֵה and אֵת יוֹסֵה, have hitherto been construed as constituting together one single example, "May יוֹסֵה smite יוֹסֵה!" with the result that from the earliest times they have thrown more darkness than light upon the Mishnic narrative. The Babylonian Talmud appends the Baraita עַד שִׁיבְרַךְ (= שִׁיקְלֵל) שֵׁם בְּשֵׁם, which it proceeds to interpret in the absurd sense that to be guilty a man must have cursed God by God. In speculating as to how this marvelous feat might be accomplished, the Gemara seriously asks whether it may be done by engraving the divine name upon the blade of a knife and with it piercing through another object upon which that name has been written, but concludes more sensibly by taking refuge in the text of Lev. 24<sup>11</sup>, according to which the simultaneous utterance of the name and cursing (anybody) constitutes the blasphemy. The Gemara has certainly mistaken the intent of the Baraita; עַד שִׁיקְלֵל שֵׁם בְּשֵׁם means that one is not guilty of blas-

<sup>68</sup> The Gemara explains that the witnesses refrained from rending their garments because they had already rent them once at the original hearing of the blasphemy.

pheming the name except he employ the vocable יהוה, which agrees entirely with the Mishna. On the other hand, a sentence in the Jerusalem Gemara upon this section shows clearly that יבּה יוסה and את יוסה must be separately construed. The witness says (*j. Sanhedrin* 25 a), אותו השם, שאמרתי לפניכם אותו קלל ובו קלל *The identical name which I have spoken in your hearing, it he blasphemed, and by it he cursed.* Hebrew scholars will not find fault with the rendering of קלל by *blaspheme* in one phrase and *curse* in another. The important point is that we have two distinct phrases corresponding in their import to the two of the text. The only object of the verb יבּה which would be in place in this example of the quoted malediction is the suffix of the second person singular, as in *M. Shebu'oth* iv. 13, יבּכה אלדּים, *May God smite thee!* and כּן יבּכה אלדּים *Thus may God smite thee!*<sup>69</sup> Nor have we reason to be surprised at the asyndetic recording of the two examples; we need only compare the several series of examples in the passage quoted above from *M. Nedarim*. The two illustrations furnished by the text, יבּה יוסה and את יוסה, are intended to cover the two forms in which it would be necessary to employ the divine name in giving and taking testimony at such a trial: as subject of the verb in quoting the blasphemous utterance, and as object of the verb in characterizing the deed. In both cases a כּנוי such as יוסה was substituted for יהוה. If we point the proper name יהוה, the כּנוי in this passage must be pointed יהוה.<sup>70</sup>

The Mishna contains additional evidence that in the centuries immediately before and after Christ כּנויים were

<sup>69</sup> The citation of these formulæ of the Mishna without the employment of a כּנוי for either יבּכה or אלדּים was not permitted in later times; see *b. Shebu'oth* 36 a.

<sup>70</sup> On this last point cf. Blau, *Altjüdisches Zauberveesen*, pp. 130 f. As a specimen of the havoc which may be wrought by construing all four words as a single sentence and adhering to the spelling of the Babylonian Talmud, we may cite the interpretation devised by Levy: *Jesus (Christ) is mightier than Joseph (his father, and so by implication, than God)!* See his *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. כּנוי. For another fantastic interpretation (יוסה = *Zeus*) see Kohut, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. iii, pp. 552 ff.

employed for the name יְהוָה which consisted of alterations of the name by the exchange of certain of its consonants. According to M. *Sanhedrin* x. 1 (b. xi. 1), "The following have no portion in the world to come: he who affirms that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is not derived from the Law, or that the Law is not of heavenly origin; and the Epicurean (freethinker). Rabbi 'Aqîba says, Also he that reads in exotic books and he that whispers over a wound, repeating 'I will put none of the diseases upon thee which I have put upon the Egyptians, for I am יְהוָה (pronounced אֲדֹנִי) that healeth thee' (Ex. 15<sup>16</sup>)."

To this declaration of Rabbi 'Aqîba which anathematizes such as practise sorcery, the Mishna appends the dictum of Abba Sha'ûl, a contemporary of Rabbi 'Aqîba, אֵף הַהוּנָה אֶת הַשֵּׁם בְּאֹתֵיחוֹתָיו. The direct point of this sentence is plainly that the mere utterance of the genuine divine name is an offense for which the penalty is exclusion from the kingdom of heaven. In Tosefta, *Sanhedrin* xii. 9 (ed. Zuckermann, p. 433), Abba Sha'ûl shares with Rabbi 'Aqîba the responsibility for the doctrine concerning sorcery, while the specification of the other offense comes first and is introduced with the anonymous הוֹסִיפוּ, *they have added*, the language, however, being otherwise identical with that of the Mishna. It may be admitted that the extreme religious penalty was attached to the act of pronouncing the genuine divine name in the opinion of only a certain minority of Rabbinical authorities. But the question of the exact penalty for what was universally considered a grave religious offense, does not concern us here. Of greater importance is the phraseology in which the doctrine attributed by the Mishna to Abba Sha'ûl is couched. הִנֵּה is not a synonym of דִּבֶּר or קָרָא or אָמַר. The Old Testament usage is poetical and figurative, and, taken by itself, affords no idea of the precise prose signification of the word in such a connection as this. הִנֵּה is not *to utter*, nor *to rehearse*, nor *to read*, a word; but *to pronounce* the letters of a word, *to combine* the letters of a word *in speech*—we should say *to vocalize*; cf. the Syriac ܠܗܝܬܝܬ and the Arabic ھجأ. The clause of Abba Sha'ûl is

therefore to be interpreted, *Also he that pronounces (vocalizes) the Name with its own consonants*. The plain implication of this statement is that the pronunciation (vocalization) of the name יהוה was permissible provided it did not employ exactly the four consonants י, ה, ו, and ה. The alternative in the mind of the speaker was certainly not the employment of אדני, as is commonly supposed. The substitution of אדני is not the "pronunciation of the name יהוה" with any consonants whatever; the vocalization of the two terms is entirely different. In other words, this declaration of Abba Sha'ul, upon the only rational explanation of its phraseology, practically tells us that it was customary, in and before the beginning of the second century A.D., to pronounce the name יהוה with substituted consonants; that is, to employ כנויים of the type indicated above as substitutes for it.

The first clause appended to the text of the Mishna in the Jerusalem Talmud is more germane to the subject than is the second. The brief Gemara reads, "Rabbi Mana said, After the manner of those swearing Samaritans. Rabbi Jacob bar Aha said, It is written with *Yodh He*, and it is read (נקרא) with *Aleph Daleth*" (*j. Sanhedrin* 28 b). The statement attributed to Rabbi Mana is manifestly a comment upon the text of the Mishna, since it consists of nothing but a dependent adverbial clause. And he rightly understood the Mishna to be treating of the secular use of the divine name: the Samaritans frequently employed the exact name; well behaved Jews made use of a כנוי. On the other hand, the statement attributed to Rabbi Jacob is an independent sentence which is entirely out of place in this connection and was originally concerned with a wholly different subject, namely with the synagogue "reading" of the name in the text of Scripture. נקרא is not a word to be used of a vocable uttered in oaths, adjurations, and unguarded conversation. Nor can we suppose that Abba Sha'ul gave himself much anxiety over the possibility of the desecration of the name in the services of the synagogue or in the Scripture quotations of the pious.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>71</sup> The rule attributed to Rabbi Jacob bar Aha in *j. Sanhedrin* 28 b is

The Babylonian Gemara on this passage of the Mishna (*Sanhedrin* 101 *b*) is of the greatest significance, both for the support it brings to the present contention and for the light it sheds upon another subject no less important, namely the pronunciation of the name יהוה. It contains only a Baraitha, as short as it is weighty: תנא בנבולין ובלשון אנה. The printed texts of the Babylonian Talmud exhibit ענה for the last word; but the word was alphabetically listed as אנה in the (eleventh century) *Arûch* of Nathan b. Yehiel,<sup>72</sup> and it is commonly admitted that the latter is the original reading, which has been corrupted to ענה in the manuscripts underlying the Bomberg and subsequent editions of the Talmud.<sup>73</sup> The meaning of the first two words of the Baraitha is, of course, perfectly plain: *It has been taught* (in limitation of the condemnation of the Mishna), *In the territory* (that is, outside of the central sanctuary at Jerusalem). But the last two words have hitherto defied successful interpretation.<sup>74</sup> It is customary to attempt the explanation of the word אנה by reference to the form אנה employed in the Samaritan Targum to render the Hebrew נקב of Lev. 24<sup>11</sup>. But this

found in entirely different contexts in the Babylonian Talmud, *Pesahim* 50 *a*, and *Qiddushin* 71 *a*. Both these passages present the rule in the form of an utterance of God in the first person, "The holy One, blessed be he, said, Not as I am written am I read; I am written with *Yodh He* and I am read with *Aleph Daleth*;" which is a fanciful elaboration of וזה שמי לעלם of Ex. 3<sup>15</sup> with the last word pronounced לעלם. It should be noticed in passing that in none of these three passages where ארני is mentioned as the "reading" of יהוה, is there any talk of בניי, or any hint that ארני was habitually spoken of in Talmudic times as a בני.

<sup>72</sup> See the Bomberg edition, Venice, 1531/2, fol. 4 *b*; Kohut, *Aruch Completum*, vol. i. p. 20; and cf. Buxtorf and Castell, *s.v.* עני.

<sup>73</sup> This corruption, as will appear, was probably not without design. Some persons seem to have understood the passage better than did the author of the *Arûch*.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*, vol. vii, Berlin, 1903, p. 446, "jedoch bleibt der Ausdruck ענה לשון dunkel." Dalman (*Gottesname Adonai*, p. 50, note) rightly rejects the interpretations of the *Arûch*, of Rashi, and of Levy, but the one he offers is equally unsatisfactory. He is of the opinion that אנה stands for אנה, which in turn is a "Nebenform" of an assumed אנה = "Das Lesen, Vokalisieren." In his more recently published *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Wörterbuch* he defines, "אנה *h.* das buchstäbliche Aussprechen"; but the Neo-Hebrew for this last is פרוש.

is to explain one mystery by another. Castell could do no more with Samaritan אנה than refer to ענה of our passage in the Babylonian Talmud, with the remark that from the Samaritans' employment of this word we may see how their hatred of the Jews did not prevent them from reading the Talmud and borrowing its vocabulary. Then, too, we have only to compare the Vulgate rendering of Lev. 24<sup>11</sup>.<sup>16</sup> to see that it is by no means self-evident that the Samaritan אנה is an exact synonym of Hebrew נקב, — to say nothing of the fact that we are not quite unanimous about the precise meaning of the Hebrew, or the circumstance that אנה, as well as כרו, disputes with אנה the latter's place in the Samaritan Targum.<sup>75</sup> Furthermore, neither of the two interpretations which naturally suggest themselves for אנה of the Samaritan Targum of Lev. 24<sup>11</sup> will suit our passage, — leaving the question of the grammatical construction entirely out of account. If we adopt the meaning *to pronounce*, the Baraitha adds nothing to the Mishna; and if we adopt the meaning *to curse* or *blaspheme*, the passage, taken in connection with the Mishna, would be reducing to a mere offense against the conscience, punishable by God alone, a crime for which the Mosaic law prescribed death by stoning. The fact is, we are far more likely to be helped to an understanding of the Samaritan text by a correct interpretation of the Talmudic passage.

The correct interpretation of the Baraitha is this: To the statement of the Mishna that among those who have no portion in the world to come is *he that pronounces (vocalizes) the Name with its own consonants*, the Baraitha adds the conditions, *In the territory* (outside of the Temple) *AND WITH THE VOCALIZATION A-G-A*.

We must remember that the Jews of the period lacked our grammatical concept of *vowel*, and that they had not exactly our clear-cut concept of *consonant*.<sup>76</sup> They did not

<sup>75</sup> See Vollers's edition.

<sup>76</sup> On the general subject of the grammatical attainments of the Rabbis, see Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebräischen Grammatik im Talmud und Midrasch*, Berlin, 1879. The author, however, fails to bring out the point made here.



separate the elements of language into two mutually exclusive and supplementary categories. A word, to their minds, had its several **אותיות** (properly **אותות**), *signs* or *letters*, which appeared upon the written page, and among which **א**, **ה**, **ו**, and **י** (no matter how employed) had an equal place with **ב** and **ג**. And it had besides its peculiar *speech* or *mode of utterance*, what we should call its *pronunciation* rather than its *vowels*. If we attribute to them the conception of *vocalization*, we must think of it in the sense of *making vocal* rather than in that of *adding vowels* to the consonants, as we are apt to do. Moreover, the letters of a word were so many distinct units, but its vocalization was one single mode of combining those units in speech. Thus **אלהים** had five **אותיות**, but only one **לשון**, *mode of utterance*, "*Aussprache*," namely *Elohîm*. Ordinarily the need of abstracting the vocalization of a word from its consonants did not arise, and the **לשון** (spoken word) would of course embody its own proper **אותיות**. But this Baraitha records an oral tradition which could not, without committing the very sin it inveighs against, specify the prohibited vocalization in the ordinary way. It accordingly effects the necessary abstraction in about the only way possible to it — by inserting an arbitrarily chosen consonant between two **א**'s. This is the nearest it can come to indicating "two syllables, with the *a* sound in each."

Confirmation of the above interpretation is supplied from a somewhat distant quarter. I refer to the much quoted passage in Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Exodum*, xv. (Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, lxxx. 244): "This (the divine name revealed to Moses) is called by the Hebrews 'unutterable' (*ἄφραστον*); for it is forbidden them to quote it with the tongue (*διὰ τῆς γλώττης προφέρειν*). It is written with four characters, wherefore they refer to it also as 'the four-lettered' (*τετραγράμμουν*) . . . . And it is called by the Samaritans *Iaβε*,<sup>77</sup> but by the Jews *Aia*." This *Aya* of

<sup>77</sup> In the previous century, Epiphanius, whose Jewish birth is at least questionable (cf. Bonwetsch, *PRE*<sup>3</sup>, vol. v. p. 418), doubtless derived his identical *Iaβε* from a Samaritan source; cf. Dietrich, *ZATW*, vol. iii. p. 298. The

Theodoret has occasioned much discussion. Gesenius<sup>78</sup> thought it reproduced the יהוה of Ex. 3<sup>14</sup>, and his view was adopted by more than one eminent scholar. It was, however, warmly disputed by Dietrich in a series of letters to Franz Delitzsch on the pronunciation of יהוה.<sup>79</sup> Dietrich refused to believe that any Jew to whom Theodoret applied for information could have been so ignorant as to suppose that יהוה was pronounced *ah-ja*, or that Theodoret would have accepted the definition of the name from Ex. 3<sup>14</sup> when he had asked for its pronunciation. That Church Father must have repaired to the most muddled and ignorant Jew alive to extract such misinformation. On the other hand, Dietrich was positive that "*ein Jude* [the italics are his] *jederzeit sich eher würde haben todt schlagen lassen, als dass er einem wirklich heidnischen, oder einem sich Christ nennenden 'נִי' den allerheiligsten Namen, wenn er auch die älteste Aussprache wusste, bloss zur Befriedigung der gelehrten Neugierde ausgesprochen hätte.*" He accordingly reached the conclusion that what Theodoret's Jew really furnished him was the simple *Ia* (the abbreviated form יהי of the Old Testament, which the Jews did not hesitate to pronounce), and that the Syrian-born theologian prefixed a prosthetic *a* on his own account.<sup>80</sup> In the opinion that no Jew would have committed the sacrilege of pronouncing the ineffable name merely to satisfy curiosity, Dietrich was quite right. No Jew would have been guilty of that act even for a more laudable purpose. But he was altogether wrong in supposing that the Jews of the time were generally ignorant of the

statement of Kautzsch, *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 3321, note 4, that the pronunciation *Iaße* is ascribed by Epiphanius to a Christian sect, is incorrect; the passage in which the name occurs, *Adv. haer.* I. iii. 20(40), is a parenthetic bit of lexicography on Epiphanius's own account, occasioned by the heretics' ignorant employment of the word *Sebaoth* as an independent name.

<sup>78</sup> *Thesaurus*, p. 577.

<sup>79</sup> The letters were published by Delitzsch after Dietrich's death in the *ZATW*, vols. iii and iv. The statements on this point will be found in vol. iii. pp. 282 f., 287 f., 293 f., 296 f.

<sup>80</sup> Dietrich preferred not to rely upon the reading *Ia*, which happens to be found in one patristic manuscript.

true pronunciation of the name,<sup>81</sup> and equally wrong in the supposition that the name was as secret as it was sacred. The Jew of whom Theodoret made inquiry evidently did indicate to that respectable and learned Gentile the authentic pronunciation of the name, and he did so without violating either its sacredness or his own conscience, by reproducing separately the abstract vocalization which belonged to the four characters יהוה. Theodoret manifestly mistook the purport of the reply, but heard distinctly and recorded faithfully the reply itself. His informant said **AYA**, agreeing entirely with the author of the Baraita in *b. Sanhedrin* 101*b*, for the medial consonant was of course arbitrarily chosen in each case and hence variable.

A word needs to be said regarding the conclusion to be drawn from the above testimony as to the pronunciation of יהוה in the Jewish tradition of the Talmudic period. The Jews, like the Arabs down to the present time, heard the sound *ā* (= *e* as in "there") only as a phase of *a* (as in "far"), and would as readily employ **א** to represent the former sound as we should spell a new word containing that sound after the pattern of "man." יהוה in the so-called Babylonian system of punctuation cannot be distinguished from יהוה. Moreover, in reproducing the vocalization apart from the word's proper consonants, they might easily emphasize the identity of the sound by a little flattening; so that not even Theodoret's *Aia* is conclusive for *a* as against *ā*. In any case, we have here conclusive evidence that the historical pronunciation of יהוה lay between the following: *Yahwa*, *Yāhwa*, *Yahwä*, *Yāhwä*. We shall have occasion to return to this subject below.

Turning now to the previous question, and assuming for the moment that the true vocalization of יהוה may be represented as *Yahwa*, the doctrine of Mishna and Baraita of *Sanhedrin* x. 1 combined is this: Only in the temple at

<sup>81</sup> Blau (*Altjüdisches Zauberverwesen*, p. 128 f.) takes issue with Dietrich on this particular point, but it has not occurred to him to ask himself how the knowledge he claims for the Jews of Theodoret's time was transmitted to them or maintained, — unless he takes seriously the story of its septennial transmission recorded in *b. Qiddushin* 71*a*.

Jerusalem was it permissible to say *Yahwa*; elsewhere one might not utter that name without committing a sin against God. But one might with impunity exchange certain of its consonants, and say (for example) *Yahma*, employing a כִּנּוּי of the name. Also one might pronounce its four consonants with a different vocalization, saying (for example) *Yehawweh*, in which case one would be expressing a wholly different word.

The evidence that it was customary upon occasion to pronounce the name יהוה in altered form is not yet exhausted. One of the designations of that name current in Talmudic times is שֵׁם הַמְּפֹרָשׁ. The intelligent use of this term ceased very soon after the close of the Talmud, and its exact meaning and origin have ever since remained a mystery. The term does not occur in the authentic text of the Mishna.<sup>82</sup> It is found, however, in the Baraitha *b. Sota* 38 *a*, in *Sifra* on Lev. 24<sup>11</sup> (104 *c*), and in *Sifre* on Num. 6<sup>23</sup> (ed. Friedmann, fol. 12 *a*), 6<sup>27</sup> (13 *b*); as well as in the Babylonian Gemara, *Yoma* 69 *b*, *Hagiga* 16 *a*, *Sanhedrin* 60 *a*, and in the Midrashim, *Shir-hashirim Rabba* on 4<sup>5</sup>, *Koheleth Rabba* on 3<sup>11b</sup>. The Aramaic שְׁמָא מְפָרְשָׁא occurs in two passages of Targum Jerushalmi II, Ex. 32<sup>25</sup> and Lev. 24<sup>11</sup>, and is employed unintelligently in an Aramaic anecdote in the section of *Koheleth Rabba* just mentioned.<sup>83</sup>

Though the suggested definitions of the term שֵׁם הַמְּפֹרָשׁ have been so numerous as to represent almost all the alternatives imaginable, thus far none can be said to have gained the general assent of scholars.<sup>84</sup> In recent times,<sup>85</sup> it has

<sup>82</sup> It is found in corrupt texts of *M. Yoma* vi. 2, which section continues to be cited in this connection; so by Blau, *l.c.* p. 124, and the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. ix. p. 162. But the entire passage in which the term occurs is an interpolation, lacking in the best manuscripts and printed texts; cf. Dalman, *Gottesname Adonai*, p. 40, note, and Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*, vol. ii., Berlin, 1901, p. 942.

<sup>83</sup> שֵׁם הַמְּפֹרָשׁ looks like a clumsy reproduction of the Hebrew שֵׁם הַמְּפֹרָשׁ. The true Aramaic would be שְׁמָא דְּמְפָרְשָׁא; cf. שְׁמָא דְּמִיָּדָר of Targum Jerushalmi I, Lev. 24<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Gottheil, *JAOS*, vol. xviii. p. 361; Blau, *l.c.* p. 124.

<sup>85</sup> For some of the older literature see pp. 504 f. of Nestle's article quoted below.

been defined by Löw<sup>86</sup> and Oppenheim<sup>87</sup> as *the name which is engraved* (upon the High Priest's diadem); by Rahmer<sup>88</sup> as *the name that is explained* (in Ex. 3<sup>14</sup>); by Grünbaum,<sup>89</sup> who has written most voluminously and most confusedly upon the subject, as *the concealed* or *the mysterious name*. By Nestle,<sup>90</sup> on the testimony of Syriac lexicographers, depending ultimately on a scholion of Jacob of Edessa (who never knew the meaning of the term and had forgotten its exact form when he wrote about it), and by Friedländer<sup>91</sup> and Bacher,<sup>92</sup> who equate it with שֵׁם הַמִּיחָד, it is defined as *the name which is reserved for* or *peculiar to* (God), that is, *the proper name*. Torrey<sup>93</sup> interprets it as *the holy name*. The following renderings are more or less related: Geiger,<sup>94</sup> "der ausdrückliche Name"; Cassel,<sup>95</sup> "der nach seinem wirklichen Laut ausgesprochene Name"; Munk,<sup>96</sup> "le nom distinctement prononcé"; Fürst,<sup>97</sup> Nager,<sup>98</sup> Levy,<sup>99</sup> and Dalman,<sup>100</sup> "der deutlich ausgesprochene Name."

So far as concerns the meaning of the verb contained in the participial form הַמְפַרֵּשׁ, the last group of definitions is certainly most in accord with the usage. Not to quote Geiger, who bases his definition of our expression upon this fact, Bacher, who thinks himself forced to a variant conclu-

<sup>86</sup> *Beiträge zur jüdischen Alterthumskunde*, I. i. p. 25.\* This and the following references marked with an asterisk I am obliged to make at second hand.

<sup>87</sup> *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, vol. xviii. pp. 545 ff., vol. xix. pp. 326 ff.\*

<sup>88</sup> *Monatsschrift*, vol. xix. p. 187.\*

<sup>89</sup> *ZDMG*, vol. xxiii. p. 632, vol. xxxi. pp. 225 ff., vol. xxxix. pp. 543 ff., vol. xl. pp. 234 ff.

<sup>90</sup> *ZDMG*, vol. xxxii. pp. 465 ff.; cf. Bernstein, *ibid.* vol. iv. pp. 199 f.

<sup>91</sup> *The Guide of the Perplexed, of Maimonides*, vol. i. p. 226, note 3.

<sup>92</sup> *Terminologie der Tannaiten*, pp. 159 f.

<sup>93</sup> *JAOS*, vol. xviii. pp. 180 ff.

<sup>94</sup> *Urschrift*, u.s.w., p. 264.

<sup>95</sup> *Monatsschrift*, vol. xix. pp. 73 ff.\*

<sup>96</sup> *Le Guide des Égarés*, vol. i. p. 267.\*

<sup>97</sup> *ZDMG*, vol. xxxiii. pp. 297 ff.

<sup>98</sup> *ZDMG*, vol. xxxv. pp. 162 ff.

<sup>99</sup> *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. שֵׁם.

<sup>100</sup> *l.c.* p. 53.

sion in the case of **שם המפרש**, has this to say of the Neo-Hebrew use of the intensive **פָּרַשׁ**:<sup>101</sup> Its standard meaning is "deutlich machen, bestimmt aussprechen, heraussagen. . . . Unser Verbum dient auch dazu, um anzugeben, dass etwas, was in der Thora unbestimmt gelassen oder nur angedeutet ist, in den prophetischen und hagiographischen Büchern deutlich ausgesprochen wird." The use of **פָּרַשׁ**, the *nomen actionis* of Piel he illustrates with **הִכֵּן פִּירוּשׁוֹ שֶׁל דָּבָר**, "Wo findet sich die Sache deutlich ausgesprochen?" **פָּרַשׁ** is further "die genauere Bestimmung einer biblischen Satzung." The adverbial **בְּפָרִישׁ** is "ausdrücklich," with a reference among others to the passage M. *Sanhedrin* vii. 5 quoted above (pp. 147 f.) The participle **מִפְרֵשׁ** means "bestimmt deutlich gekennzeichnet," as opposed to **קָטְיוּם**, "unbestimmt, undeutlich."<sup>102</sup> Bacher goes on to say that **מִפְרֵשׁ** has still another signification, "abgesondert," but the examples he cites yield the closely related meaning of "distinguished" rather than that of "detached." Moreover, for our present purpose it is most important to consider the sense in which **פָּרַשׁ** is used in connection with the divine name. In the passage we have quoted from the Mishna, *Sanhedrin* vii. 5, the intensive of **פָּרַשׁ** has the divine name as the object, and the meaning there is unmistakable. The blasphemer is not guilty *until he reproduce exactly the Name* (**עַד שֶׁיִּפְרֹשׁ הַשֵּׁם**), that is, until he make use of the exact name. And further on in the same paragraph, **אָמַר מֶה שֶׁשָּׁמַעַת בְּפִירוּשׁ**, *Repeat exactly what thou didst hear*; and according to the express statement of the text, **בְּפִירוּשׁ** indicates **יְהוָה** as against **יִסָּה**. To this we may add the testimony of the Aramaic usage in connection with the divine name. In Lev. 24<sup>11, 16</sup> of both Targum Onqelos and Targum Jerushalmi I, forms of **פָּרַשׁ** are used to render the Hebrew **נָקַב**. Whatever be the precise meaning of **נָקַב**, whether *to utter* or *to curse*, no one will pretend that it is *to separate*. Compare also the Peshîṭa of Lev. 24<sup>16</sup>. It remains to point out that the act of speaking is not necessarily bound up in the conception of **פָּרַשׁ**. It

<sup>101</sup> *l.c.* pp. 154 ff.<sup>102</sup> *l.c.* p. 137.

means to *indicate exactly* by any means. So in Targum Jerushalmi I of Ex. 32<sup>25</sup> we have חֲקִיק וּמִפָּרֶשׁ = *exactly engraved*, and in Targum *Koheleth* 3<sup>11</sup> כְּתִיב וּמִפָּרֶשׁ<sup>103</sup> = *exactly written*; in both cases of the divine name. In view of all this evidence I fail to see how it can reasonably be questioned that Hebrew הַמִּפְרֵשׁ is *that which is exactly indicated or set forth*.<sup>104</sup>

Now in spite of the facts we have rehearsed, the rendering *the exactly pronounced name* for שֵׁם הַמִּפְרֵשׁ has not hitherto met with general acceptance. The basic objection to it was voiced by Nestle in 1878: "Wie das Tetragrammaton [which as a matter of fact was not pronounced] der deutlich ausgesprochene Name genannt worden sein soll, wenn nicht wie *lucus a non lucendo*, sehe ich nicht ein."<sup>105</sup>

In meeting this objection, we must consider a point which has not received the attention it deserves, namely, the gram-

<sup>103</sup> See Levy, *Das Targum zu Koheleth nach südarabischen Handschriften*, Breslau, 1905, p. 11.

<sup>104</sup> The Old Testament ἀπαξ λεγόμενον מִפָּרֶשׁ, used adverbially in Neh. 8<sup>8</sup>, admits of no other rendering than *with accuracy*; and the Perfect Pual of Num. 15<sup>34</sup> demands the corresponding interpretation, לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה לוֹ כִּי לֹא פָרַשׁ מִהּ יַעֲשֶׂה לוֹ, *for it had not been exactly set forth (specified) what should be done unto him*.

A similar interpretation is required for the Pael passive participle in the Syriac term ܡܥܬܪܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢܝܢܐ which continues to be erroneously rendered "The Gospel of the Separated Ones"; so Burkitt, *Evangelion Dampharreshe*, Cambridge, 1904, vol. ii. p. 31, "that is, the Gospels divided into the four volumes of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John"; cf. *Encyc. Bib.*, col. 4999. But when were the Gospels divided? Of this interpretation Torrey very properly remarked in 1897, "There could be no reason for speaking of the four Gospels as 'separated'; least of all if they were to be contrasted, *as the original form*, with a mixture like the Diatessaron" (*l.c.* pp. 178 f.). That the term ܡܥܬܪܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢܝܢܐ is, however, antithetical to ܡܥܬܪܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢܝܢܐ, which serves to characterize the Diatessaron, cannot be doubted, as was shown by Gottheil (*ibid.* p. 361). But it does not follow that ܡܥܬܪܬܐ is therefore *the separated*. The antithesis of *harmonized* or *combined* is not *disharmonized* or *separated*, but *unharmonized*, *uncombined*. And this is precisely the purport of the participle ܡܥܬܪܬܐ, reproduced in their exact or authentic form. ܡܥܬܪܬܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢܝܢܐ is therefore *The Gospel of the (four) exactly reproduced*, or as we should put it, *The (four) Gospels in their exact form*. For the rest, it seems to me that even when employed of ordered lections, the idea embodied in the participle is that of *exact demarcation* rather than that of *division*.

<sup>105</sup> *l.c.*, p. 505.

matical form of our expression. All the renderings of שם המפרש (the engraved name, the explained name, the concealed name, the proper name, the holy name, the express name, the distinctly or exactly uttered name) treat the term as if it consisted of a determinate substantive with attributive adjective attached, that is, as Neo-Hebrew for השם המפרש. But that is not the actual construction in this case.<sup>106</sup> שם המפרש is not an attributive adjective, but a substantive in the genitive. The true solution of the matter seems to me this:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{שם המפרש} &= \text{השם} = \text{שם יהוה} \\ \text{שם יהוה} &= \text{שם המפרש} \\ \text{יהוה} &= \text{the vocable המפרש} \end{aligned}$$

Once more I call attention to the terminology of M. *Sanhedrin* vii. 5. The vocable יוסה we are told is a כְּנִי of יהוה. So that when pronounced יוסה, or with any other exchange of its consonants (יְכִנִּי), the name יהוה would be מְכִנֶּה; on the other hand, when pronounced יהוה, it is הַמְפָּרֵשׁ. This meets fully the objection expressed by Nestle, and at the same time supplies additional confirmation of the proposition with which we set out; for of course the mere existence of the expression requires us to assume that the name was sometimes purposely mispronounced. The term שם המפרש, then, is not *the name which was exactly pronounced*, but *the name יהוה with its exact pronunciation*. We may now quote one of the earliest passages in which the expression occurs, *Sifre* on Num. 6<sup>23</sup> (fol. 12a): כה תברכו את בני ישראל בשם המפורש או אינו אלא בכינוי ת"ל ושמו את שמי על בני ישראל בשם המפורש ובמדינה בכינוי

<sup>106</sup> Grünbaum concluded that we have here "ein neugebildeter, besondrer Kunstaussdruck," *ZDMG*, vol. xxxix. p. 556; and Torrey agrees with him. It is not, however, the meaning of מפרש that is peculiar in this expression; it is the construction.

<sup>107</sup> By this I do not in the least intend to imply that שם יהוה in the Old Testament is "das Wort Jhvh," as Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes*; on which see Heitmüller in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for 1905, cols. 369 ff. The equivalents indicated above are purely scholastic, and would have been quite impossible in an age when people habitually used יהוה immediately of the person of their God.



*"Thus shall ye bless the children of Israel." — That is, with the name in its exact form. Thou sayest, 'In its exact form? — am I not to understand, with a surrogate?' The statement is, "They shall put my name upon the children of Israel:" — with the name in its exact form; only in the town with a surrogate.*<sup>108</sup>

In the foregoing pages I have attempted to show (1) that the Masoretic text of Ex. 3<sup>14</sup> goes back to the fourth century B.C.; (2) that v. 14<sup>a</sup> is an interpolation dependent upon the reading **אֲדֹנָי שְׁלֹחֵנִי אֵלֵיכֶם** of 14<sup>b</sup>; (3) that the reading **אֲדֹנָי** in 14<sup>b</sup> represents the alteration of an original **יְהוָה**, which had not been effected at the beginning of the fifth century B.C.; (4) that that alteration was not accidental, but due to the purpose to prevent the utterance of the ineffable name in this one passage of the Pentateuch where the employment of the ordinary synagogue surrogate for **יְהוָה**, namely **אֲדֹנָי**, was from the nature of the case impossible; (5) that the alteration took place, accordingly, sometime during the fourth century B.C., most probably coinciding with the spread of the Pentateuch and the rise of the Jewish synagogue; and finally (6) that such alterations, both of the name **יְהוָה** and of other religious terms, in cases where it was necessary to employ the word and yet desirable to avoid its actual pronunciation, are abundantly evidenced for the ensuing period; the regular method of alteration being to exchange one or more of the consonants of the word while leaving intact its syllabic and vocalic cast. If these positions have been satisfactorily sustained, **אֲדֹנָי** of Ex. 3<sup>14b</sup> is a purely phonetic **כְּנִי** of **יְהוָה**, entirely devoid of meaning, and differs in sound from the proper name of the God of the Hebrews only in substituting **א** for **י** and **י** for **ו**.

I have not overlooked the fact that in one unimportant respect the word **אֲדֹנָי** is unlike the other purely phonetic **כְּנִיִּים** which have been adduced from the Rabbinical literature: it is not in itself a non-word that can never be anything but a **כְּנִי**. It is, however, in my judgment, a sufficient reply to this superficial objection to point out that in the

<sup>108</sup> Cf. p. 144 above.

fourth century B.C. the device of the כִּנִּי was doubtless still in its incipency; and further, that the selection of אֱלֹהִים was clearly suggested by the words כִּי אֱלֹהִים עִמָּךְ, put into the mouth of the Deity in the preceding v.<sup>12</sup>; it so happened that the requirements of a phonetic כִּנִּי were fully met by this word, which from its essential character as a verb could not be mistaken by the hearer for anything but a surrogate of יְהוָה. Of this we may be certain, that אֱלֹהִים was chosen to replace יְהוָה solely because of its phonetic availability and without any regard to its positive lexical value, — exactly as *bleu* is used for *Dieu* in French oaths.

On the other hand, the virtually contemporary interpolation of v.<sup>14a</sup> with its אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר אֱלֹהִים, leaves no doubt whatever that אֱלֹהִים of <sup>14b</sup> was pronounced as the first person singular Imperfect of the verb הָיָה, and is not a merely coincidental group of letters of whose vocalization we can know nothing. This being so, our passage supplies us with much earlier evidence as to the vocalization of the name יְהוָה than any we have hitherto possessed. For we now know that in the fourth century B.C. it was pronounced with the same vowels as was the first person singular Imperfect of the verb הָיָה.

It is established, in the first place, by native testimony of the best possible kind, that the name consisted of but two syllables. The testimony is the best possible, because the only better would be a direct statement that the word had two syllables, which is impossible in the mouths of people who lack the concept of "syllable."

There remains, in the second place, the question as to the quality of the vowels of the verbal form אֱלֹהִים in the fourth century B.C. As regards the vowel of the second syllable, the question can be definitely answered. הָ of the Imperfect Qal of לָהֵא verbs, according to the best judgment of modern scholars, represents a direct transition from former *ai* (אֵי),<sup>109</sup> which must, however, have ceased to be heard before the form was spelled with final ה. The vowel of the second syllable of אֱלֹהִים, therefore, had the sound of *e* in "there" or *a* in "fare." Regarding the short vowel of the first syllable, we cannot

<sup>109</sup> See Kautzsch, § 75 e, and the literature there cited.

be quite so precise. The vowel of the preformative of the Qal Imperfect of all verbs was originally  $\tilde{a}$ , and according to the Tiberian punctuation it had not departed very widely from that primitive sound in the case of the first person singular, when the vowel-points were invented. It is true that the so-called Babylonian system of punctuation points the prefix of the first person singular, like that of the other persons, invariably  $i$ .<sup>110</sup> But that certainly represents a later, not an earlier, phase of development than the one arrested by the Tiberian pointing. For the line of phonetic change in the quality of the vowels is from (1)  $a$  as in "far" to (2)  $\tilde{a}$  as in "fare" (=  $\tilde{e}$  as in "there"), to (3)  $e$  as in "pet," to (4)  $i$  as in "pretty" (=  $i$  as in "pity"). Moreover, just as we have no ear for (2) in very short syllables, so the Hebrews had no ear for (3) except in long syllables. The phases to be reckoned with in the short first syllable of אִדִּיר are therefore,  $a$ ,  $\tilde{a}$ , and  $i$ . And there exists no reason for supposing that the Palestinian pronunciation had already traveled through the final  $i$  stage and was on the way back again when the vocalization was fixed by means of the Tiberian pointing. The statement of Qimchi<sup>111</sup> that אִקְטַל was pronounced with Seghol in the prefix to distinguish it from יִקְטַל need not be taken seriously, even if we admit that the latter was pronounced  $iqtol$  (without consonantal  $j$ ). In Modern Arabic the vowel of the prefix of the Imperfect has been changed to  $i$  in all persons but the first singular, where, under the influence of the  $\aleph$  and without the aid of artificers, it remains  $a$ .<sup>112</sup> So in Hebrew, the influence of the guttural  $\aleph$  checked and prevented the development of the

<sup>110</sup> See Kahle, *Der masoretische Text des ATs nach der Überlieferung der babylonischen Juden*, p. 53. Yet according to Diettrich, *ZATW*, vol. xx. pp. 153 f., Yemen manuscripts of Targum Onkelos point the prefix of the first person with  $a$  in Aramaic only under the influence of the Hebrew!

<sup>111</sup> See Kautzsch, § 47 b.

<sup>112</sup> See Vollers, *Lehrbuch der aegypto-arabischen Umgangssprache*, p. 28, and cf. his note 3 on p. 29.

König, *Lehrgebäude*, i. p. 159, says, "Der ursprüngliche Vocal der Präformativa, nämlich  $\tilde{a}$ , hat sich im regelmässigen Verb immer zu  $i$  zuge-spitzt, welches durch  $\aleph$  zu  $\tilde{e}$  zerdrückt wird." But when was the  $\aleph$  absent, that there might be a point to crush?

vowel in the prefix of the first person to the *i* form reached in the case of the other persons.

Accordingly, in the fourth century B.C. אֲדֹנָי was pronounced either 'ahyā or, with a slight sharpening of the first vowel, 'ähyä. Similarly, in the fourth century B.C. יְהוָה was pronounced Yāhwä, with possibly a slight modification of the first vowel in the direction of Yähwä. And we have only to turn away from the printed page and trust entirely to the ear, to realize that the short vowel of the first syllable may very well have varied from one shade to the other in different localities and individuals. This conclusion is in harmony with the testimony of the Baraita in *b. Sanhedrin* 101 *b*, and with the statements of Epiphanius and Theodoret, which have been noticed above.